DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 492 EA 002 885

AUTHOR Melton, George E.; And Others.
TITLE The Principalship: Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the 70's.
INSTITUTION National Association of Secondary School Principals, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 70p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00, Quantity discounts)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Background, *Administrator Evaluation, Administrator Responsibility, Administrator Role, *Contract Salaries, Evaluation Techniques, Leadership, Leadership Qualities, *Occupational Information, Performance Criteria, *Principals, Salary Differentials, School Environment, *Secondary Schools

ABSTRACT

This document has three parts: (1) an updated job description of the secondary school principalship, (2) a modern approach to an evaluation of the principal's performance, and (3) a statement of how to determine salaries for principals. The text stresses that the principal must perform a variety of roles: educational leader; administrator; communicator between students, staff, community, other schools, board of education, and colleagues; conflict mediator; educator of educators; ombudsman; and professional. It is emphasized that the performance of a principal must be evaluated on the basis of all the roles he performs, and that objective evaluation instruments such as graphs and checklists fail to evaluate the entire responsibility. Results of a national survey on administrative salaries, arranged alphabetically by school district, are appended. Data are categorized according to (1) relationship between supervisory/administrative and teacher schedules, and (2) considerations and factors taken into account in setting supervisory/administrative salaries. (DE)

PRINTED BY THE STANDARD REGISTER COMPANY, U. S. A.
FORM 0601

ED040492

THE PRINCIPALSHIP

Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the 70's

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 002 885

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright 1970
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

Two dollars per copy. Twenty percent discount for 10 or more copies. Special rates for 25 or more copies available upon request. Payment must accompany orders of five dollars or less.

Foreword

American educational institutions are experiencing phenomenal change, and the secondary school principalship is no exception. It is predictable that this rate of change will accelerate over the next decade. Herein lies a challenge, for if the principal's status and remuneration are to be commensurate with his ever-more-demanding tasks, updated criteria will be needed to insure that his modern role will be more precisely defined and that his salary will provide more adequate compensation for his labor.

Recognizing that it is imperative that the NASSP contribute to the establishment of these criteria, the Association's Status and Welfare Committee recommended that the Association prepare a new statement on principals' salaries. This statement would be supported by a new job description and suggestions concerning how to evaluate the principal's performance. Accordingly, the Association brought together a study-group composed of six educators who, together, represent a wide variety of secondary school interests and experience. The group was divided into three teams; each team collaborated on one of the major sections of this booklet.

The major contributors to Part A of the section on salary determination were Harry J. Hartley and James J. Richards of New York University. Part B of that section was submitted by McManis Associates, a leading management consultant firm that recently completed a study of NASSP's operations. We are grateful to all of them for their contributions.

It is obvious that this publication's recommendations cannot be considered in any way binding on any school system. The NASSP, however, will be very pleased if this statement exerts a persuasive influence not only on professional educators but also on the public, upon whose understanding and support the future of the principalship and our system of education ultimately rests.

Owen B. Kiernan
Executive Secretary

Authors

I. Job Specifications for Principals (1)

George E. Melton, *Principal*
Woodbury Junior High School
Shaker Heights, Ohio

John Stanavage, *Executive Secretary*
Commission on Secondary Schools
North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
Chicago, Illinois

II. Evaluating the Principal (11)

Julius C. Bernstein
Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Livingston, New Jersey

Willard Sawyer, *Principal*
Kennedy High School
Fremont, California

III. Salary Determination for Principals (19)

A

Edward B. Byhre, *Principal*
Hubert Olson Junior High School
Bloomington, Minnesota

Harry J. Hartley, *Head*
Division of Educational Administration
New York University
New York, New York

William Koloff, *Vice President*
Organization of School Administrators and Supervisors
Detroit, Michigan

James J. Richards, *Assistant Professor*
New York University
New York, New York

B

Gerald L. McManis, *Senior Partner*
McManis Associates
Washington, D.C.

Project Director—Charles R. Hilston, *Director of Field Services*
National Association of Secondary School Principals
Washington, D. C.

I. Job Specifications for Principals

NEW societal forces are changing the roles that the principal traditionally has played and are making obsolete many of the grounds rules within which he traditionally has operated. In certain respects, this makes his job more difficult, but, at the same time, it is clear that new opportunities for growth and leadership are being presented. In short, the way is open for an altered, vigorous principalship to emerge, a principalship that will differ markedly from its predecessor.

During this transitional period, it is more important than ever before that the principal retain his authority within his school, as he is in the best position to keep the school stable in the face of possible disruptions and to make sure that any changes made are orderly and reasoned.

But if the principal is not to forfeit his claim to that position of educational leadership to which he rightfully aspires, he must be *eager* to take the lead in channeling the forces of change so that they benefit his school and its learning process. He must at the same time take steps to insure that he has a major hand in the necessary reappraisals and restructuring of his profession. If he surrenders this task to others, he may rapidly lose his importance.

This reappraisal and restructuring presupposes that the principal has a sure grasp of what his role ought to be. It is the intent of this chapter, then, to provide some guidelines to help him define his place in our contemporary educational community.

One point should be made clear, however: Any description of the scope of the secondary school principalship as it exists today —or even tomorrow—must be tentative, always subject to change as conditions themselves alter. The principalship of the 80's, for example, may bear little resemblance to the portrait of the principalship sketched here.

In addition, as we consider the varied components of the secondary school principalship, it becomes obvious that the

attention of the principal will be pulled in many directions, and that no one person could hope to achieve all these tasks with equal effectiveness.

The principal and his administrative team will be confronted with an endless succession of priority-choices, and the priorities will shift as circumstances dictate. Some tasks will now be of pressing urgency, clamoring for the principal's close consideration; others will be eclipsed by more insistent problems and demands. The decision as to which to stress and which to subordinate reflects the administrative acumen of the principal, a quality fundamental to his worth to the school.

Hence, no attempt has been made in his chapter to place the principal's many roles in any special order of precedence. Priority decisions must be made locally by the principal and his administrative staff.

With these caveats, we shall examine the varied hats that the principal must wear.

*An Educational Leader**

The principal is an *educational* administrator, with all that the term implies. His major responsibility should be—in cooperation with his staff—to direct, guide, and coordinate the total educational program within the school.

His cardinal function is the *improvement of instruction*, which will enhance the learning experiences of his students. The principal, then, is first and foremost an instructional leader: All his other activities must directly support this central function, or else he jeopardizes his *raison d'etre*.

This instructional responsibility means stressing the effectiveness of the school's teaching-learning process rather than simply increasing the efficiency of its administration. As educational leader, the principal—

- keeps instruction and learning foremost in his own planning, making certain that they are central to *all* school deliberations.

---

* Several of the descriptive category titles were taken from NASSP's own service brochure published in 1969.

- adapts the school's program and procedures to the requirements of the individual student. He is also sensitive to the needs of the individual teacher and he sees that human values are not slighted for institutional convenience.
- helps to establish and clarify both short and long range goals for his school, and makes sure that they are both educationally sound and administratively feasible.
- encourages his staff to suggest new ideas and to try new ways of doing things. He, therefore, acts as a catalyst for innovative thinking and action on the part of others in the school.
- does not hesitate to suggest his own ideas for program, curriculum, and organization.
- accepts accountability for the over-all effectiveness of the school. He touches both edges of the sword of leadership: authority and responsibility.
- fosters sound interpersonal relationships among the students, the teachers, and the administration.

As an educational leader, the principal must also be a skillful supervisor of instruction. Supervision, however, is a far more complex function than the simple observation of teachers. It entails organizing and developing the teaching staff into a coherent unit committed to creating the best possible situation for the students. Among the many aspects of this supervisory role are the following:

- building a competent, balanced, professionally-alert staff through sound selection, thorough orientation, and continuing in-service activities
- supervising individual teachers to assist them in their self-improvement efforts
- evaluating teacher performance on the basis of cooperatively-determined objectives and criteria
- nurturing potential staff leadership by providing opportunities for professional growth.

An Administrator

The secondary school, like any other corporate endeavor, requires conscious and constant administration. No school can realize its purposes without someone assuming the responsibility of helping the many persons involved clarify objectives, identify problems, establish priorities, develop strategies, and assess progress. Moreover, if utter chaos is to be avoided, someone must integrate into a meaningful whole the discrete, disparate efforts of those who, taken together, constitute the school. It is, of course, the principal who is charged with this vital leadership role.

Obviously, the principal must possess the requisite authority to execute the mandates of his office. He must be more than a *pro tem* chairman of a debating society. And yet, in the democratic climate prevailing in our American schools, this authority will be more derived than attributed, more a matter of professional respect earned than position status granted. In addition, the principal must share decision-making at various levels of involvement with teachers, students, parents, and community groups. This sharing ought not to impair his own authority; it should, rather, make it stronger, more resilient, more effective than ever before.

As an administrator, the principal will—

- direct policy-making at the building level; and participate in the decision-making at all other levels when the policies in question affect his school's operation.
- implement policy, accepting the responsibility, while sharing the authority in whatever manner he considers to be in the best interests of the school.
- modify policy, when he judges it desirable to do so. When he does not possess the authority to permit the modification, he recommends the changes to those who do.
- broaden the base of his decision-making, involving students, teachers, parents, and citizens whenever appropriate.

Although the principalship may be thought of as a single function, it will, as noted above, be carried out by a number of people: the administrative staff and the faculty.

In developing his administrative staff, the principal will face a number of difficult questions: Under what circumstances can authority be delegated? When can responsibility be shared? How can tasks be efficiently subdivided?

In answering these and other questions, the principal, who is the administrator of an *educational* institution, will operate under constraints and circumstances different from those that shape the role of, say, an industrial manager. For one thing, the principal works within a *community* of teachers, staff assistants, and students. His effectiveness hinges upon the respect of those *with* whom, not *through* whom, he must work. The principal must learn how to help his colleagues grow—and how to grow with them.

It is useful, then, to think of the principal, at least in part, as a *strategist*, managing the human resources available to the school to accomplish the school's stated purposes. Again, however, this management role cannot be totally equated with similarly designated posts in industry. Unlike industrial managers, educators always seek the best product, even if it is more costly, i.e., less efficient administratively. As an example, regarding the principal for a moment as a manager of teachers, his sole intent should be to help them attain increasingly higher levels of instructional effectiveness; they ought not to be managed for ends alien to their own professional concerns.

The key concept in this emerging principalship is *accountability*. The principal must be held responsible for the impact the school has on the students coming to its door, whether that impact be positive or negative. He must help to establish the job-targets for the school; and once these are established, he must not evade the responsibility for the success or failure of the school in reaching these goals. Ideally, all the professionals involved in the school—teachers, central office personnel, and principal alike—should share that accountability, but in his role of educational leader, the principal bears a unique responsibility, a responsibility that cannot be delegated.

An Interpreter

The principal is a communicator, explaining the school's goals, procedures, and objectives to everyone concerned. As an interpreter, he presents the school, its program, its purposes, its philosophy, its problems, to:

- the *students,* so that they may understand and appreciate the conditions under which they learn
- the *staff,* professional and non-professional alike, to provide them with that overview of the school so difficult to obtain in the relative isolation of the conventional classroom or school building
- the *community,* with all its varied publics, so that the school becomes meaningful to them in terms of its social purposes
- the *other schools* in the district, so that the educational process of the district is unified and articulated
- the *central office* and the *board of education,* so that the higher echelons understand what the school's needs are and what it is trying to accomplish
- his *colleagues* in the principalship, so his school will share in the new developments in American education and benefit from the experience of others.

This communication must be two-way. Not only must the principal interpret the school to the community: he must also interpret the community to the school. This sort of interaction applies to all of the above target groups.

A Conflict Mediator

Conflict occurs in all organizations. This is doubtless beneficial, since conflict gives institutions much of their vitality. Hence, the duty of the principal is not to eliminate conflict within the school but rather mediate it when it does arise, so that it does not weaken the unity of the school or threaten the achievement of its goals.

Thus, as conflict mediator, the principal—

- recognizes his responsibility for establishing a climate in the school that will make disruptive conflict unnecessary (though admittedly never impossible). The school should

be able to permit strong differences of opinion to exist without their disrupting its tenor.

- is realistic enough to realize that conflict will arise as people differ sharply and passionately on means and ends.
- recognizes in the ingredients of a conflict those opportunities that may exist for promoting personal and professional growth.

The principal must learn not only how to live within the terms of the negotiated contract but also how to direct the terms of that contract towards the enhancement of teaching and learning within the school. He must do more than simply carry out the stipulations of the contract; he needs to help both the board and the teachers understand the potential for better schools that is implicit in the very process of negotiation. He must, therefore, have an active part in the negotiations.

An Educator of Educators

The principal is a *specialist* in secondary education. He also realizes that secondary education is a distinct field which, while supportive of and supported by the elementary and higher education levels, makes its own unique contribution. He, therefore, provides information and direction to students, staff, parents, central office, superintendent, and board of education, keeping them all alert to the developments and trends in the field.

Furthermore, the principal, while deferring to the expertness of teachers in their individual subject fields and specific scholarship, understands the elements of good teaching and shares his insight with the teachers. He is a resource person who can help the individual teacher appraise and improve his own teaching effectiveness. And being acquainted with the principles and practices of high quality secondary education, the principal knows the balance, the sequence, and the degree of freedom that are desirable for an innovative curriculum. This might well be his major contribution to his school's curriculum development.

An Ombudsman

The principal must be able to step back from time to time and objectively and impartially criticize his own efforts. This is especially true when a person appears before him seeking relief or redress from some school action.

In these instances, the principal will be required to serve as the advocate for people who are questioning the very school structure or policies he has helped to create and which he administers. He must function as an ombudsman, so that the school does not end up sacrificing an individual to the requirements of the institution. He must stand as a bulwark against that insidious depersonalization that so quickly can blight the nobler purposes of the school.

This ombudsman role is increasingly being demanded of the principal, as those in our secondary schools desperately struggle to keep the schools from losing their human dimension. It is a role that demands an open-door policy on the part of the principal, inimical as that policy may be to the performance of his other pressing responsibilities. It may prove to be the one function the principal will never be able to delegate. If so, the perspectives of the principal will have to alter dramatically in the years ahead.

As ombudsman, the principal will—

- provide counsel and assistance for all youth, dissident as well as cooperative.
- open his door to all teachers, militant as well as passive, non-conformist as well as agreeable.
- work sympathetically with all parents, aggressive as well as bewildered.
- challenge his own school, when it proves to be restrictive of individual growth and aspiration.

A Professional

The principal is more than the head of the local school. He began as and continues to be a professional teacher among teachers, and a professional among his principal colleagues

across the nation. It is incumbent upon him to contribute to his profession, as well as to derive benefit from it. If he remains wrapped in parochial isolation, both his effectiveness and the effectiveness of his school will be lessened.

Because of this, the principal has an obligation to maintain his professional growth by continuing university level work; by attending conventions, workshops, and seminars; by keeping abreast, as well as he can, of the literature in secondary education; and by contributing to that literature himself. Indeed, every district should encourage or perhaps even require *all* its secondary principals to attend as many professional events within and outside the immediate district as is feasible. The requirement should be made practical by a personal professional growth fund for the principal of no less that four percent of his salary.

As a professional, the principal—

- participates in continuous study and research in secondary education and administration.
- regularly attends the conventions and annual meetings of his professional associations.
- contributes to the programs of and seeks leadership positions in those associations.
- contributes to the secondary principalship by means of articles and speeches.
- shares with his fellow principals his knowledge, his understanding, and his comfort when the occasion requires.

Moreover, as the number of assistant principals increases within the school, there will be a strong tendency for each to undertake specialized functions, confining his particular efforts to clearly delimited areas. This division of administrative tasks has much to recommend it, since it enables quick and incisive expertness to be applied to specific problems. But it also denies the various assistant principals a fuller apprenticeship in administration. and may, therefore, limit their professional growth.

It is important, therefore, that the principal organize his administrative corps so that each assistant principal is a generalist. In this way, once fully prepared, he can move promptly into a principalship of his own. The principal must afford his assistants that depth and breadth of administrative experiences that will permit them ultimately to measure themselves against the demands of the principalship itself and to undertake the position with a high degree of confidence.

Summary

When one ponders the extensive responsibilities of the secondary school principal, it becomes apparent that the task may well be beyond the physical capacity of any one person. In this chapter, we have in reality been describing the *principalship*, a position that comprises a complex of functions, all of which are overseen by one man or woman, who is given the appropriate authority and who stands accountable for what is achieved.

In view of the scope of the role we have just outlined, we feel impelled to add one more point. The principal is not a machine, an automaton programmed for 24-hour duty by the board of education and the community. He is a very human being, with social and family commitments, with limits to his energy and creativity, and with the usual need for rest and relaxation. We urge superintendents and board members to remember this when they and the principal sit down to decide on the school's goals and its staffing.

The contents of this chapter should be kept in mind when reading what follows, which is a discussion of the principal's formal evaluation.

II. Evaluating the Principal

THE contemporary principal's success should be measured by how well he performs the activities and discharges the responsibilities described in the previous chapter. The problem is that, traditionally, this measurement has been made by means of objective evaluation instruments such as graphs, checklists, temperature charts, and other devices, all too many of which are inadequate in that their criteria (1) are too general and impersonal, (2) tend to include too much that is mundane, and (3) often confuse means with ends.

In addition, the principal, when he is measured by these standards, is generally regarded *solely* as an administrator by *objective*, i.e., he is evaluated according to the degree to which he satisfies pre-determined *task*-performance criteria. It is not our intent to suggest that administration by objective is necessarily a secondary goal. Very often, however, the principal's true effectiveness depends on how well he administers by *exception;* i.e., how he anticipates, identifies, and copes with the myriad of intangible but critical factors that influence the achievement of successful *job-targets.*

It is time for some definitions. A "task," as we use the term, is some concrete duty that the principal must perform as part of his ordinary, day-to-day routine. Granted: The successful completion of "tasks" is absolutely vital to the school's stability and progress. But "tasks" tend to be far more demanding of time than of imagination. They are all too often rote and repetitive. They may not be closely related to the larger issues of education; indeed, they might impede the principal as he tries to address these issues. "Tasks" are the sort of duties that may lead a principal to reflect at the end of the day: "I worked like a galley slave all day and accomplished nothing."

A "job-target," on the other hand, is an objective that relates to the long-range issues of school improvement. "Job-targets" are likely to have significant impact on such areas as curriculum or community relations. As such, they require the principal to

use all his powers of imagination and all his administrative skills. "Job-targets," then, are goals that are worthy of being the core concerns of the modern principal.

We contend that the principal ought to be evaluated by how well his job-targets are accomplished, *not* only by how well his tasks are done.

Moreover, we believe that his response to the unpredictable problems and intangible factors that arise in the course of administering his school must be an integral part of such evaluation.

What do we mean by "unpredictable problems" and "intangible factors?" Here are a few that might develop in the course of a school year: student behavior that does not conform to the behavior that is traditional to the school; varying teacher effectiveness in implementing curricula, particularly new curricula; community tension that expresses itself in attacks on the school; budgeted funds that are not appropriated; teacher contract difficulties that provoke either staff apathy or aggressiveness, perhaps reaching the extreme of a work stoppage; and just plain human frailty or cussedness.

We believe that, when the principal's performance is judged, it is imperative that the greater weight be placed on his success as an administrator by exception. It is in this role that he displays his flexibility, his humanity, his ingenuity and innovative spirit, his courage, and his concern for those problems of the school and the community that are not foreseen nor provided for in the rather broad purposes of an objective, evaluative instrument.

We concede that from the employer's point of view, evaluation is easier when it is applied only to the principal's more tangible, objectively-measurable responsibilities. However, we stress again the salient importance of subjective considerations, and the performance of responsibilities that require the mastery of a combination of skills and the ability to function well in a complex and fast-changing situation.

Stated simply, the modern principal must be evaluated in terms of how well he organizes the resources at his command, first to define and then to achieve truly important job-targets.

His ability to coordinate the talents and opinions of the many people—and institutions—with which he must deal will be the key to his success. Consider what is involved in the five-step process of administering a job-target. (It should be added that the phrase "what is involved" ought quite properly to refer not only to the problems of coordinating the efforts and knowledge of others, but also to the demands made on the principal's own personal storehouse of knowledge.)

Step One: Identifying the full range of possible targets

To find out what is necessary or desirable for his school program, the principal must use all the available data-finding devices: surveys, tests, reports, questionnaires, and opinionnaires. Also, he must closely observe what is happening around him and take the time to reflect on what he has seen. And, in addition, he must interview and consult with his faculty, his administrative staff, and as many students as possible; these consultations may be the most important method of all, as it is the people in the school who have the clearest idea of "where it's at."

Step Two: Settling on achievable targets

Not everything that people in the school think ought to be done, however, can or should be done. Once the principal has a thorough overview of the many things considered desirable by his staff, faculty, and students, it is up to him and his supervisor to decide which of these constitute acceptable and achievable job-targets.

The decision should be based on a number of factors. First, targets must be capable of being delimited and made precise so as to afford the principal and his staff a reasonable chance to define them, establish evaluative criteria, and achieve some results. To be sure, targets ought to call into play the full range of the principal's skills, but no target should be so broadly defined that it amounts to a virtual restatement of the principal's schoolwide responsibility, and is, thus, for all practical purposes, impossible to measure.

For example, a problem such as "Improvement of Communication" encompasses so much that it would defy any attempt either to establish a clear approach to its solution or to construct any method to measure results. Since this problem of communication occurs throughout the school, what would the principal concentrate on? Students communicating with teachers? With other students? Faculty communicating with administrators? Intra-faculty communication? Staff communicating with the community? The principal himself communicating with any or all of these?

The lesson, we trust, is clear: The job-targets must be within reach.

A second criterion for targets is that they must be capable of completion and evaluation in a fixed period of time, or perhaps in a series of fixed time-periods.

Finally, there are a host of other factors that might have some bearing on the final decisions. These are considerations of money, personnel, community sensitivities, and the like. The principal, with his intimate knowledge of his own school and the community that surrounds it, will surely be able to weed out many of the suggestions as being neither necessary nor feasible. And his supervisor, whc will almost assuredly be either the school superintendent or someone from the superintendent's office, will employ his broader view of the district's problems to reject or modify others.

Step Three: Establishing performance criteria

Performance criteria must be written with great care, as they will form the basis of the supervisor's eventual evaluation of the principal. The criteria should state what will be considered a minimally acceptable performance. In addition, they should define what the principal and his supervisor consider to be optimum objectives, i.e., the best results that can reasonably be hoped for.

Step Four: Getting the job done

The targets have been set and the performance criteria have

been established. Now comes the hard part—actually reaching the goals.

It is this step in the process that requires the principal to bring into play all the many talents that he possesses. He must have insight into all the singular skills and aptitudes of the individuals on his faculty and staff and be able to detect who might contribute what to any given project. He must be an educational leader, explaining to each contributor just what is expected of him and how it relates to the big picture; to do this, of course, he must have a clear view of the big picture himself. He will be obliged to put on his diplomat's hat, to coordinate all the variegated efforts of his personnel and to mediate and resolve the inevitable conflicts. As ombudsman, he must listen to complaints and take action to redress grievances and remove roadlocks. In short, he must be the complete leader, ready to steady the uncertain, prod the lethargic, and commend the worthy.

It is during this phase that we see the principal acting in his role of administrator by exception. He will start off with a coherent plan and a nice, neat time-schedule. But the realities of life have a way of reducing these to shambles. We have mentioned in an earlier passage what form these realities are likely to take; let it suffice here to restress that the principal's professionalism will meet its most severe test in coping with these sudden crises and how he meets this test ought to be an important factor in his evaluation.

If the target assignment is composed of distinct stages, it would benefit the principal to pause at the end of each stage and conduct an evaluation of how things have developed and what the prospects are for the next stage's success.

Step Five: The final evaluation

The final evaluation is done by the principal and his supervisor. This process ought to be initiated by the principal, the first step being his evaluation of his own performance. The two administrators will measure the achievement of the job-targets assigned to the principal, always bearing in mind the

restrictions and constraints that might have been placed upon him by the variables discussed above.

To conclude the evaluation process, the principal might report in full on the results of his evaluation to those who worked with him, so that all may share in the lessons learned from the experience.

We call the reader's attention to the total lack of any mechanical or graphic charts, such as checklists, in our evaluative schema. We repeat our belief that such devices have little purpose, oriented as they are to personal characteristics or to means, often unrelated to accomplishments of ends. We emphasize once more that the only evaluation appropriate for the modern principal is that which rates him in terms of how well—or how poorly—he achieved specific objectives, and what qualities of leadership he revealed while administering his projects.

* * *

Through this article, we have been discussing "job-targets." What might some of these job-targets be? We must state at the outset that the individual characteristics of each school district and community will greatly affect the identification of all job-targets. But even in the face of this, we believe that some samples of job-targets may be valuable to the readers, and so here are ten of them:*

1. Extension of meaningful curricular activities for terminal students in a school that is heavily college-prep.
2. Development of a program of independent study in all subject areas.
3. Establishment of interdisciplinary curricula in math-physics or in shorthand-English (everybody knows about English-history or the humanities).
4. Modifying student attitudes and behavior in order to reduce vandalism, theft, mischief, fighting, cheating, or any selected combination of aberrant behavior.

---

* Several of these targets are derived or quoted from the material on appraisal developed in the Cincinnati Public Schools.

5. Stimulating staff alertness and reaction to current research and thinking in particular approaches to subject fields.
6. Reorganizing staff meetings—departmental and general.
7. Revising a student handbook, a teacher's manual, or a body of written school policies.
8. Developing a more systematic and effective pattern for parental conferences with teachers or counselors.
9. Setting up study committees for review of current instructional and resource materials in social studies or industrial arts (as examples).
10. Extension of teacher understanding and use of visual materials with emphasis on the overhead projector and the opaque projector.

We shall conclude our discussion of the principal's evaluation with an example: the job-target plan of a principal in a large high school in the West.

Job-Target

To reduce daily student absence from ten percent to six percent within the time limit of the fall semester.

Plan and Process

- Assign the management of the program's day-to-day details to the vice principal.
- Place one-third of an assistant principal's time at the disposal of the vice principal to be used in the resolution of the problem.
- Initiate case conferences composed of teachers, counselors, special service personnel, and administrators to assess the causes for student non-attendance and to initiate a plan of action for individual students having attendance problems.
- Identify categories and cases of high incidence of absence.
- Develop a systematic daily contact with parents of absentees to determine causes for an absence. (These contacts are to be made by telephone or home visitations.)

- Use the school nurse and psychologist in a working partnership with students and parents when a health or emotional problem appears to be a primary cause for absenteeism.
- Initiate teacher-student conferences to determine the need for individualizing a student's learning experiences.
- Initiate truancy hearings for students and their parents when there is evidence of poor home support for regular school attendance.
- Establish a schedule of monthly meetings with the principal for progress reports. The vice principal and his staff will provide statistical data on daily attendance, student-parent contacts, teacher-student contacts, truancy hearing reports, and case conference reports.
- Assess the data presented at the monthly meeting and formulate further plans and processes, with necessary modifications, based on the assessment of needs.
- Conduct a final evaluation of the target data with the staff, with appropriate conclusions on basis of success or failure.

III. Salary Determination for Principals

A

AT the present time, little uniformity exists in the approaches used to determine the annual salaries for secondary school principals in the nation's approximately 18,000 operating school districts. Principals in some districts have developed elaborate, detailed salary indexes, whereas principals in other districts prefer to negotiate their compensation on an individual basis with the board of education. There is, however, a discernible national trend towards use of some form of collective negotiations procedures by secondary school principals. In a few cases, the formal demands made by bargaining agents of principals reflect a militancy similar to that so often attributed to teachers' groups. Usually, a highly professional, non-militant approach is used. Principals are actively involved in attempts to improve their position within the overall compensation system of education, which includes consideration of salaries, benefits, and professional working conditions.

The general purpose of this section is to explore current and future approaches to salary determination for principals. More specifically, the objectives are three-fold:

1. to establish criteria for designing fixed index ratios for salaries
2. to analyze five alternative ways of determining salary schedules
3. to recommend methods of improving salary determination.

Criteria for Designing Salary Structures and Fixed Index Ratios

Equity to administrators and accountability to board and community demand that salary determination possess a rationale, a consistency, and a reasonable predictability. None of these is possible unless criteria are identified and applied uniformly.

The responsibilities of the principalship have already been delineated in Section I. On the basis of the discussion in Section II, it is suggested that the use of job titles as a guide to salary differentiation should be discarded as inconsistent and inequitable for describing responsibilities and duties. This suggestion is made because the size of a school system substantially modifies the job content and its status in relation to other positions. For example, an assistant superintendent for business affairs in a small district might perform duties that in a larger district would be distributed among Directors of Budget, of Transportation, of Cafeteria, of Buildings and Grounds Maintenance, of Purchasing, of Research and Planning, and so on. Any classification according to job titles assumes that a given set of responsibilities and duties are easily implied and typical of school systems everywhere. This simply is not true. Yet how many districts base administrative salaries on just such a hierarchy of job titles – a hierarchy that assumes a gradation of responsibilities and duties without job descriptions backed by evidence derived from observation. Such a description would answer the question: What does a person in such a position actually do?

This "job title" practice leads to problems. For example, an assistant principal of a large school may be performing at a greater level of responsibility and undertaking more tasks than the principal of a very small school.

The authors question this "job title" approach, advocating instead a procedure that requires a job analysis and observation of the required task-performance of each position within the system. The results of this process would determine the salary structure. The proposed job analysis and observation would be guided by the criteria in Table 1. (See following page.)

The criteria require a careful analysis of *the person* (requirements and qualifications), *the responsibilities* assigned, *the tasks* actually performed, and *the conditions* under which they must be performed. This approach to salary determination may, in fact, result in a hierarchy of salaries quite different from the hierarchy of status positions identified by job titles. With the "job title" method, salaries correspond to prestige and status; with the suggested approach, salaries would be based on pro-

Table 1

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNING AN ADMINISTRATIVE SALARY STRUCTURE

Areas of Focus	*Elements of Criteria*
A. Personnel (Qualifications required)	Education (degrees, credit units), training (knowledge, expertise), certifications, experience, nature of any special skills or expertise (e.g., knowledge of computer technology), and others.
B. Task (Duties performed or behaviors executed)	Description of tasks actually performed, time demands (length of day, evening and weekend time commitments), quantity and frequency of contacts with public, nature of any unique services performed (negotiating, in-service training, public relations, campaigning for bond issues, budget), and others.
C. Structure (Authority and responsibilities assigned)	Nature of delegated authority and assigned duties, status in relation to other administrative and non-administrative positions, span of control, number of people supervised and evaluated, financial responsibility (amount of fiscal authority and accountability), and others.
D. Environment (Situational factors or working conditions)	Degree of conflict and tension of specific position, degree of pressures and stress of assigned tasks, degree of creativity and innovation required, nature of the composition of student body (minority?) and community (low socio-economic status?), condition and adequacy of facilities, adequacy of staff, and so forth.

ductivity. In the simplest terms it means, "He who produces, receives." An administrator's salary ought to reflect his contribution to the school system. He should be paid for what he does, not for what he is, or where he is, or whom he knows within the system.

This approach lends itself readily to a fixed ratio, if the ratio system is the salary-determination method the local administrators desire. It is the most frequently used approach at this time. Almost half the school systems in cities of 300,000 or over use some form of index formula. As the school systems get smaller, the frequency of an index system increases so that some 65 percent of systems with pupil enrollment of 6,000-11,000 use an index system for establishing the salary of principals. The steps required would be as follows:

1. Establish the base line for computing the base administrative salary: for example, a 1.50 ratio of the midpoint in the teachers' salary schedule. This base salary would then represent the 1.00 ratio for administrators.
2. Establish the "ratio increment range" for each criterion, for example:
   a. Personnel ..... .01 to .30
   b. Task ..... .01 to .50
   c. Structure ..... .01 to .40
   d. Environment ..... .01 to .30
   In this system, an administrator potentially could earn a maximum ratio of 2.50 of the base salary.
3. Establish the "ratio value" for the elements within each criterion. For example, the doctorate from an accredited institution might carry a .05 ratio value; or, each year's experience, a .02 ratio value. These ratio values could be added until the maximum of the ratio increment range was reached. This acts as a limit.

Once the details of the base line, the ratio increment range, and the ratio value have been decided upon, individuals can be rated and placed on the scale easily.

Two important characteristics of this system should be noted. First, a maximum would be set for each criterion and for the

salary range as a whole (2.50 of base in the example given). A person could earn ratio values that are disallowed upon reaching the maximum. Controls, therefore, are built into the system so that a reasonable predictability for budget purposes is possible.

Second, negotiations would take place over ratios (values or ranges), not dollars: the focus is on scales, not people. This allows for a consistent and manageable method of establishing salary increments from year to year and a technique that more realistically rewards a person's contributions to the school system.

Thus, a system of salary determination with a rationale, consistency, and reasonable predictability is both possible and feasible.

This approach, however, raises the serious problems of stability and the capacity of a school system to support a fixed index ratio. No organizational system remains constant. Job descriptions will vary no matter what criteria are employed. Furthermore, equity will demand that these descriptions be reviewed periodically (every two or three years) according to the established criteria.

Alternative Ways to Develop Salary Schedules

Once a school district has decided on role (job) descriptions and developed procedures suited to achieve job objectives, then it is ready to develop a salary schedule. There are a number of possible ways, in addition to the one already cited, to construct a salary schedule. Five options are identified below:

1. *An index ratio based on the teachers' salary schedule.* Such an approach is expressed in the following formula:

   $C = B (R \times T) + F$, where

   C = Administrator's compensation

   B = Base teachers' M.A. maximum salary plus any additional levels of training attained by the administrator.

   R = Role ratio which encompasses knowledge, skills, responsibility, and so on.

T = Time ratio between the regular school day and school year for teachers and the principal.

F = Fringe benefits such as longevity, tax sheltered annuity contribution, or super-maximums.

2. *An index based on a minimum administrators' salary.* Ratios would represent differentials between administrative roles; no reference would be made to teachers' salaries. For example, the lowest scheduled administrative salary might represent the base. Or, a variation of this approach which might be advantageous, is one that reflects the current emphasis on the administrative or management team concept of school administration. Here a district might base the principal's salary on that of the superintendent. The salaries for other administrative positions would be computed using varied ratio differentials. To this would be added a training differential. Such a scheme would require an increment step schedule to account for the service factor.
3. *A direct index ratio based on the teachers' salary at the principal's appropriate level of training and experience.* This is a variation of option 1.
4. *No salary schedules for administrators* (completely individualized negotiations).
5. *A basic schedule supplemented by individual negotiations,* such as is currently employed in the performing arts (actors, entertainers), among other areas.

Alternatives 1 and 2 appear to be the more efficient methods of salary administration. They minimize inconsistencies of application because no fixed sums are involved, thereby assuring internal equity, consistency of application, and predictability. Moreover, they facilitate the flexibility necessary to meet changing objectives and roles. This is possible with a minimum of conflict because only the role and time ratios must be adjusted through collective negotiations. After such adjustments, the rational differentials among roles still maintain a constant relationship. For purposes of illustration, examples are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2
DIRECT RATIO INDEX SALARY STRUCTURE
(Teacher's Salary)

Position	*Role Ratio*[a]	*Time Ratio*[a]
High School Principal	1.60	1.15
Junior High School Principal	1.50	1.15
High School Assistant Principal	1.35	1.075
Junior High Assistant Principal	1.30	1.075

Using the Table 2 structure, the salary for one high school principal would be computed as follows (assume the base teacher's salary is $15,000.)

$$C = B\,(R \times T) + F$$
$$\$29{,}100 = \$15{,}000 \times (1.60 \times 1.15) + \$1500$$

Table 3
DIRECT RATIO INDEX SALARY STRUCTURE
(Superintendent's Salary)

Position	Role Ratio[a]	Time Ratio[a]
High School Principal	.7	.1
Junior High School Principal	.6	.1
High School Assistant Principal	.5	.025
Junior High Assistant Principal	.4	.025

Using the Table 3 structure, the salary for one high school principal would be computed as follows (assume the base superintendent's salary is $35,000):

$$C = B\,(R + T) + F$$
$$\$29{,}500 = \$35{,}000 \times (.7 + .1) + \$1500$$

[a] Ratios are illustrative only.

Many school administrators and boards believe that alternatives 4 and 5 are not desirable for setting salaries at this stage in the development of performance assessment techniques. They are difficult to put into practice because of the lack of explicitly stated and rationally derived criteria. These approaches also depend to a great extent upon individual ability as a negotiator and frequently on prior professional reputation. They tend to be limited to the one-high-school systems at the present time.

The basis for compensation should, as previously stated, be expertise brought to the role, and not the role itself. An explicitly devised *role ratio index* accounts for such expertise gained through training and experience. Under current practices in many schools, administrators are receiving varying rewards for the same training and experience.

Another issue in considering administrative salaries is that of conflict of interest resulting from direct indexed ratios. This is a critical question because administrative salaries in public education are implicitly related to a teacher base, regardless of how they are devised. If we may borrow terminology from game theory, a fixed sum game in negotiations does *not* exist. In the private sector, the resources (profit) for managerial salaries can be increased in direct proportion to the lowering of labor costs. Such a condition is not present in public education. However, conflict of interest is present where building administrators serve as negotiating agents for the board in teacher salary matters. This conflict is resolvable through modification of the negotiating role played by building administrators. For example, secondary principals might act as resource specialists, or agents of the board of education, where issues relating to their areas of jurisdiction and expertise are under consideration in the negotiations, but remain apart when salaries and fringe benefits are being negotiated.

In those communities where principals have found it desirable to organize their own negotiating units, their salaries will be determined through the activities of this unit.

Finally, the topic of state-mandated salary minimums should be mentioned. Some eleven states have provisions for principals in their minimum-salary laws. States handle the subject in various ways, including schedules which provide recognition for training and experience, supplements to the teacher salary schedule, and amounts to provide additional pay for work done beyond the regular school year.

Many authorities believe that the idea of minimum-salary laws has a built-in danger of the minimum becoming the maximum for the position rather than a "floor" that supports much

higher salaries. And yet, if the precedent of state minimum salary laws for teachers holds true for those laws referring to principals (and, at this writing, three times as many states have such laws for teachers than have such for both), this fear is unfounded. The basis for this opinion follows:

According to a recent report, ". . . mandated minimum teachers salaries, even though set at lower than desirable levels, have served and continue to serve as an effective device to improve salary standards, for successive increases in the teacher pay scales established by law are generally accompanied by increased state appropriations to the localities for salary purposes." And, "built into these higher legally prescribed salaries is a measure of local responsibility placed by law on the school systems over and above the state school support." [1]

Summary and Recommended Procedures

No effective *compensation system* can be devised in a piecemeal, fragmented manner. Therefore, in determining administrators' salaries, consideration must be given to all other positions in the school system.

In developing any compensation plan, the first step is to identify the roles and functions needed to achieve the organizational goals and explicit program objectives. The board of education, therefore, with the assistance of the professional staff, must first agree on goals.

The next step should be to evaluate and describe the elements of each position; by "elements," we mean such things as technical skills, knowledge required, and scope of responsibility delegated. These are complex factors that do not lend themselves to precise measurement. One measure of knowledge is formal training; another is certification; a third is the experience of solving similar problems. In much the same way, "scope of delegated

---

[1] *State Minimum-Salary Laws for Teachers.* Research Report 1968-R15. National Education Association, 1968. p. 13.

responsibility" covers many factors: span of control; level of instruction; breadth of program; number of persons evaluated; quantity and frequency of contacts with the public; fiscal authority and accountability; and the extent of decision-making and creative thinking required.

The next major step is to decide on the relative importance of each position (in terms of the descriptions), with particular attention given to graded authority, responsibility, and difficulty.

Finally, assign a monetary differential for the several classes of positions. The following questions should be considered in arriving at the differentials:

1. Are the salaries commensurate with the described duties and responsibilities?
2. Will the salaries attract and maintain the kind of personnel desired?
3. Do the salaries reflect the intention to employ administrative leadership rather than merely managerial service?
4. Does the salary plan provide for increases over a period of years upon evidence of satisfactory service? Stated another way, does the salary plan provide safeguards against favoring persons with long tenure and minimal performance at the expense of those who meet performance standards?
5. Is the plan internally consistent; is it competitive with other systems' plans?

After a salary plan is devised it should be measured against the five questions listed below:

1. What are its cost implications? These costs could be related to a program budget instead of a conventional object budget in order to increase public support for schools.
2. Is it politically feasible in regard to the probable reaction of the community, the board, administrators, and teachers?
3. Does it meet legal prescriptions?
4. Is there precedent for its institution?
5. Can it be administered effectively with a degree of predictability regarding performance, outcomes, and costs?

If the plan answers all or most of these questions satisfactorily, an arrangement should be devised that assures a smooth transition from the old to the new schedule. It is also necessary to agree on procedures that allow for periodic evaluation and revision to account for new positions, redirection of goals, and adjustments that will maintain internal equity and uniformity within roles.

B

IN this statement, the author would like to extend the discussion of the principal's compensation by considering the following questions:

1. What is the national trend for principals' salaries?
2. How do principals' salaries compare with those of executives filling similar positions in the private sector?
3. What are some trends that can be projected for principals' compensation in the future?

National Salary Trends

One of the most respected salary surveys is published annually by *School Management* magazine in its "Cost of Education Index." In the 11th compilation, published this January, we find the following significant information: [1]

First, inflation has had as severe an impact on education as it has had on every other aspect of the economy. While expenditures for instruction — which include principals' salaries — have risen 123 percent over the past nine years, the inflation index rose an estimated 63 percent.

In other words, merely to *duplicate* the instructional program that cost $201 during the 1958-59 school year, current expenditures would have to total $328. Expenditures have risen to $449, thus providing a "real" increase of only $121.

Stated in another way, $6.30 of every $10 added to a school system's budget has been burned up by inflation.

During 1969-70, salaries for principals, vice principals, and other non-classroom instructional personnel[2] rose 5.2 percent, compared to an approximate 6 percent gain in the "inflation index." Consequently, it is safe to assume that a large portion

---

[1] "Cost of Education Index." *School Management.* Orland F. Furno and James E. Doherty. January, 1970. p. 35.

[2] Guidance counselors are another major group.

of the membership in NASSP "earned more last year but enjoyed it less!"

The national median salary for this group (non-classroom instructional personnel) was $11,625.01 in 1969-70. The national median for the high quarter was $14,000; and for the high 10 percent, $16,686.80.

It is important to note, however, that geographic location greatly influences these figures. For example, the national median for this group was $11,625.01; the median for Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, however, was only $8,713.43, while the median for Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, and Hawaii was $14,023.29, a difference of $5,309, or 62 percent.[3]

As might be expected, salaries of principals and instructional personnel other than classroom teachers are also related to the size of the school district. The median salary for this group in a small school district with actual enrollment in the 300-600 range was $9,227.75, while the median salary in a very large school district with an enrollment of over 25,000 was $12,815.06.[4]

Over the past three years, average per-pupil expenditures for teacher salaries have increased 6 percent overall, 10 percent for the high quarter, and 10 percent for the high 10 percent. Administrator salaries in the same period and the same categories have increased 4 percent, 11 percent, and nearly 10 percent. In actual dollars, the average teacher salary in the median district has increased $1,859 since 1966-67. Over the same period, principals have had a $2,306 pay rise.[5]

Thus, while some principals believe that teacher bargaining groups have at times negotiated increases to the detriment of the total education budget and their own salaries, the fact is that principals have kept pace—at least as far as national averages show.

National averages, of course, are not much help to many principals in financially hard-pressed school districts, as in one

---

[3] "Cost of Education Index." *School Management.* pp. 47-48.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 51.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 58.

major Eastern city where the financial crisis brought about a 2 1/2 percent salary reduction for principals.

To summarize the answer to the first question, "What is the trend for principals' salaries?" it can be reported that they have generally kept pace with the salaries of others in elementary and secondary education—but all groups have fought a delaying action against the eroding effects of inflation. In fact, less than half of the total increase in principals' salaries in the last ten years has resulted in spendable income.

Salary Comparisons

The second question is even more complex: "How do principals' salaries compare with those of persons holding similar positions in the general job market?"

A general answer to this question ignores such important considerations as the psychological returns from a particular position, including status questions and transferability of skills.

Comparability with industry is also complicated by the fact that some industries pay better than others. Salary differentials between high paying and low paying industries can be substantial.

As a recent article in *Nation's Business*[6] points out, there are several reasons for this. One seems to be *the degree of difficulty of the management job.* While it is hard to prove that managing is more difficult in any one type of company than in another, there are observable differences. *Profitability of the industry* is another factor. The more profitable industries tend to pay more. A third factor concerns the *type of industry involved.* Businesses that manufacture unique products, own patents, or boast of technological advances or some other distinctive factor tend to pay higher salaries; basic commodity businesses tend to pay lower salaries.

In studies of both education and industry, the author has been struck with the comparability of functions of a chief executive

---

[6] *Nation's Business.* November 1969. p. 60.

officer in any organization. As industry has moved away from organization by function toward the establishment of divisions or profit centers, they have created an echelon of "Level #2" executives; these are division managers or functional managers who report to the office of the chief executive.

Our professional experience tells us that these positions are much like those of the secondary school principal in terms of general responsibility.

Salaries for these division managers vary in proportion to their industries' sales volume.

The following table shows these salary levels.[7]

SALARIES OF LEVEL #2 EXECUTIVES: DIVISION MANAGERS AND FUNCTIONAL MANAGERS

Division Managers Size of division (by sales volume, in millions)	Salaries (in thousands)		
	High	*Medium*	*Low*
$ 1 to 5	$ 32	$ 29	$26
5 to 15	43	37	34
15 to 25	52	44	39
25 to 35	59	48	42
35 to 50	64	53	44
50 to 75	70	58	48
75 to 125	80	65	53
125 to 250	95	76	59
250 to 500	112	90	68
500 to 1000	135	108	78

From the data provided in this table, it can be seen that the smallest industry pays its division managers a medium salary of $29,000 per year; the "high" average runs $32,000; the low, $26,000.

The next largest industry groups pays 37K, 43K, and 34K (K = thousands) in these three categories. At the top of the scale

[7] *Ibid.* p. 63.

are those major industries with sales volume over 500 million per year, where the range is from 78K to 135K, with an average of 108K.

You may be interested in the job factors that were analyzed to support the conclusion that the position of principal is approximately equivalent to that of division manager.

The point method of job grading prevalent in industry was used. This method considers the following factors:

1. Skill—The education, experience, ingenuity, and initiative required of a position.
2. Effort—The special requirements of mental and physical effort required.
3. Responsibility—For supervision, for program, for resources, and for product.

The author has analyzed these factors in depth for school districts and has been impressed with the comparability of the principal's position with that of a division manager within industry.

To summarize the answer to the question of the comparability of principals' salaries: There *are* areas of comparability, and industry pays approximately 30-40 percent more for the same skills. But as mentioned earlier, this ignores the question of transferability of skills and psychic return.

Future Salaries

Now for the third and possibly most interesting question: What about salaries for principals in the future, i.e., the 70's.

Principals' salaries will probably improve significantly. It would not be realistic to conclude that the reason for this will be the simple recognition—unprompted by crises—by citizens, parent organizations, and governing boards that it is vital to establish salary levels based upon the importance of the duties and responsibilities of the principals' position. General major salary adjustments will probably result from a number of less-than-desirable "outside catalysts."

There may well be a parallel between the college and university presidency of the 60's and the principalship of the 70's. In the early 60's, salaries of college and university presidents were extremely low; yet, such positions were coveted by those within education, industry, and government. Not only did the position title carry prestige, but it also had the erroneous "image" of being not too demanding. This "myth" was exploded in the mid-and late-60's as student activism emerged and financial difficulties made the position *visibly* challenging.

As a result of this greater visibility, presidential salaries within colleges and universities were significantly increased. In most cases, the responsibilities of the position remained *basically* unchanged, although to be sure the position's difficulties in certain areas did become more severe. What *did* change was *recognition* of the difficulty of the position by the public, governing boards, and members of local and state political entities.

Accompanying this new perception was the further realization —always implicit and often stated—that presidents were *accountable* for managing their institutions, and they must be ready and capable of assuming this responsibility.

During the 70's, the difficulties of the challenge facing principals will become more visible to the public. Student activism may become more pronounced, and the principal will have to explain and justify the relevancy of his school's educational program to news media, parents, and students. Teachers will continue to seek union representation, and the principal will continually have to weigh teacher demands against the capability of his school to accommodate them. Operating costs will continue to spiral, and the principal will have a major responsibility in the determination of new ways to continue to provide quality education within limited financial resources. The list of challenges could be extended, but these will serve as examples of what we mean.

These factors will provide the principals' position with visibility; the resultant recognition of the complexity and difficulty of the position will, in the 70's, result in a general upward salary adjustment in principals' salaries.

But, while the principal will enjoy greater compensation in the 70's, the new visibility of his position will require him to be a more effective administrator than ever before, as his performance will be more closely monitored. This intensified scrutiny, of course, means that he must learn to accept increased *accountability*, a subject that has been discussed in an earlier chapter.

Because of the visibility and accountability of the principal's position in the 70's, principals' salaries will slowly begin to approach the salaries of those in comparable positions in industry.

Incidentally, the ability to measure the performance of the division managers and functional managers is another factor which in the past has contributed to this wide salary discrepancy between industry and education.

While there will be no "profit centers" in education in the 70's —thank goodness—principals will also have ample opportunity to demonstrate their ability to function effectively within accountable positions.

The reader should not be misled by these statements: In spite of the fact that some inroads will be made toward closing the salary gap with industry, education will have to continue to attract those whose paramount interest is still *service to youth*.

There will be another important area of change: Emphasis will shift during the next decade from the question of salary to that of "total compensation." It is probable that more principals and their employers will come to recognize that the salary paid an executive is just one part of a larger compensation program.

While a school district does not have stock or stock options to offer its executives, it can construct very attractive *total* compensation plans. Among the elements of such programs will be:

- Significantly improved medical insurance plans, to include family dental coverage and extended benefit programs, as well as provision for annual physical examinations.
- Income protection plans, to include total disability programs.

- Increased emphasis on tax-sheltered annuities, including special programs to guarantee college expenses for dependents.
- Special contributions toward retirement, including maintenance of retirement centers.
- Special benefits, such as automobiles, other provisions for travel, and vacation centers.
- Special educational assistance, including tuition programs and special programs for in-service education.
- Bonus plans based on successful attainment of predetermined objectives.

This writer trusts that our society will come to realize that it must find better ways to reward those who are its most useful contributors. Principals can look forward to the 70's as a time of continual improvement in the compensation provided our educational leaders.

Appendix

Selected Data on Administrative Salaries

The data on principals' salary schedules that follow were compiled by Edna-Jean Hershey, Director of Personnel Practices and Procedures of the Denver Public Schools. Dr. Hershey collected this information originally for the Denver Public Schools' own administrative-supervisory team, in order to clarify somewhat the issue of the use of ratios based on teachers' salaries and ratios based on other administrators' salaries. She has graciously permitted NASSP to report the results of her efforts in this publication, for which we now express our most sincere appreciation.

NASSP warns the reader that because of the purpose of her study and the complexity of the data, it was necessary for Dr. Hershey to interpret some of the material that the various school systems sent to her. Neither she nor NASSP, therefore, can accept the responsibility for any interpretations that a particular school system may not consider as completely accurate.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND	Independent of teachers' schedule except for base pay factors Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6500-$10,700 M.A.—$7000-$11,400 Doc.—$8000-$12,400	Formula: **Base pay** plus **differential** = **maximum salary** **Base pay:** basic schedule applicable takes into consideration: (a) years of **experience** in the school system (b) **academic preparation,** recognizing the A.B., M.A., M.A. + 34 semester hours, and Doc. degrees Over the years, the teachers' M.A. maximum has proved to be rather constant as the basis of academic preparation. **Differential:** recognizes: (a) **additional duty time** (10- and 12-month positions) (b) **responsibility** As an example of what constitutes "responsibility," a breakdown of this factor for principals showed schools divided into 7 groups with each assigned a range of weighted composite standard scores computed on the basis of **pupil population,** size of **professional staff,** number of **building employees,** and **program and organization** (highest number of points for this). Change to a higher principal group is possible on the basis of atypical or special situations, such as formulation and administration of a practice teaching program, in-service education for the District's teachers, training of students for specific occupational standards and for community service, school for the physically handicapped, student work-study programs, administration of more than one building, formal daily program in excess of 5 hours, and abnormally high pupil turnover. Consideration of **responsibilities** inherent in other supervisory/administrative positions (compared to those of principals) plus **professional judgment** provide the basis for the setting of the salaries for such personnel. Arbitrarily assigning a base of 1.00 to the 1968-69 differential paid to 12-month principals of schools with the lowest number of weighted composite standard scores ($2600), the following ratios result for administrative-supervisory positions:

Supervisory/Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 188 days)	Arbitrary Differential Ratios Applied
Principals:	All 12 months	
V		1.00
IV		1.23
IIIB		1.46
IIIA		1.69
II		1.92
IB		2.15
IA		2.46

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries		
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND—continued		Supervisory/Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 188 days)	Arbitrary Differential Ratios Applied
		Assistant principals	12 months	1.00
		Specialist	12 months	1.00
		Supervisors:	All 12 months	
		II		1.46
		I		1.69
		No numerical designation		1.92
		Directors:	All 12 months	
		II		2.46
		I		2.77
		Position		
		Principals VI	10 months	0.54
		Special assistant	10 months	0.54
		Specialist	10 months	0.54

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries			
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS	Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum ($11,250) = 1.00 Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6500-$10,700 M.A.—$7050-$11,250 Doc.—$8150-$12,350	Supervisory/Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 180 days)		Ratio Applying
		Principals (all levels)	11 months	Gr. 7	1.60
		Assistant Principals (all levels)	Not stated	A.B.	1.128
				M.A.	1.178
				Doc.	1.227
		Coordinators	Not stated	Gr. 4A	1.255
		Assistant Directors (Grades apply to various specialties)	11 months	Gr. 4A	1.255
				Gr. 5A	1.375
				Gr. 6A	1.425
		Directors (Grades apply to various specialties)	11 months	Gr. 5A	1.375
				Gr. 5B	1.40
				Gr. 6B	1.45
				Gr. 7	1.60
				Gr. 9	1.65
		It is presumed that supervisory and administrative personnel beyond the Assistant Principal category would have Master's degrees, but the printed schedule does not so indicate. Rates of pay for a given year appear to be for a flat amount of money.			

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
BUFFALO, NEW YORK	State law requires 1.3 ratio for principals above what they would receive as a teacher with comparable education and experience. Other supervisory/administrative positions are independent of teachers' salary schedule except for education and longevity allowance. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6800-$10,700 M.A.—$7405-$11,605 Doc.—$8310-$12,510	All administrative salaries include recognition of **advanced preparation** (Bachelor's degree plus 30 semester hours) and the same **longevity** payment for service as provided for teachers (amount not specified). Administrative and supervisory salary schedules are constructed about the principals' schedule, but no formula has been developed for this purpose. In order that a comparative basis might be shown in the table below, however, the maximum salary of the principals in the smallest elementary school ($14,237) has been arbitrarily set as 1.00:

Position	Work Year (School year = 187 days)	Arbitrary Ratio Applied
Principals:	187 days	
Elementary—fewer than 25 teachers		1.00
—25-39 teachers		1.03
—40-54 teachers		1.06
—55 or more teachers		1.09
Middle, Junior High, and Senior High:	187 days	
—fewer than 70 teachers		1.15
—70 or more teachers		1.18
Assistant Principals	Not stated	
Elementary		0.88
Secondary		0.93
Supervisors	12 months	1.03
Directors	12 months	1.18

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS	Independent of teachers' schedule Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$7350-$11,025 M.A.—$7770-$11,812.50 Doc.—$8230-$12,640	The salary schedule for principals is based on the number of teachers on the staff and provides for 10 steps to maximum. Administrators on a 12-month basis have salary schedules which provide for 5 steps to maximum. In the listing below, a base of 1.00 is arbitrarily assigned to the **maximum** salary for principals of schools assigned the fewest number of teachers ($16,054.50) with other ratios also based on maximum for the position. —continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS—continued		Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 200 days) — Arbitrary Ratio Applied Principals: Up to 21 teachers — 200 days plus 10 days — 1.00 21.1-32 teachers — paid vacation for all — 1.03 32.1-43 teachers — principals — 1.07 43.1-56 teachers — 1.10 56.1-77 teachers — 1.14 77.1-120 teachers — 1.18 120.1 and over teachers — 1.21 Assistant Directors (category I) — 12 calendar months — 1.10 Directors: Category II — 12 calendar months — 1.18 Category III — for all — 1.26 Category IV — 1.35 Category V — 1.55 If a principal is in charge of two schools, teachers in both schools are added together with the principal placed in the category resulting. 8-hour a day teachers in a vocational or trade school counted as 1.2 teachers in figuring total teaching staff. All assistant principals are on the teachers' schedule plus $60 a month at minimum for 10 months; the extra amount at maximum (5th year) ranges from $60 a month in the smallest schools to $160 a month in the largest schools.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
CINCINNATI, OHIO	Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00 1968 calendar year M.A. maximum is $10,376, but using the 1967 calendar year M.A. maximum of $10,245 as 1967-68 is the latest year for supervisory and administrative salaries (NEA). On a few occasions, they have also given across-the-board increases. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6000-$9849 M.A.—$6527-$10,376	Master's degree apparently highest recognition given to preparation. Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 182 days) — Ratio Applying Principals: Elementary: Under 450 pupils — 209 days — 1.20 Over 450 pupils — 209 days — 1.37 Junior High — 219 days — 1.51 Senior High — 239 days — 1.67 Assistant Principals: Elementary — Not stated — 1.15 Junior High — Not stated — 1.22 Senior High — Not stated — 1.33 Coordinators — Not stated — 1.31 Supervisors — Not stated — 1.37 Directors — Not stated — 1.67

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
CLEVELAND, OHIO	Index or ratio plan was abandoned in January, 1967 as a result of negotiations with the Union representing the administrative group. However, comparison of former ratios with the current salary schedule indicates that basically maximum salaries still retain a ratio relationship. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6250-$9600 M.A.—$6550-$10,750 M.A.+—$6550-$11,000	40-week **work year** for principals, assistant principals, supervisors, and coordinators. Work year for other supervisory and administrative personnel apparently in excess of 40 weeks but not over 48 weeks. Teachers apparently work 38 weeks as the following **administrative promotion formula** would indicate: **ADD (+) Items 1, 2, and 3:** 1. Current salary or salary for ensuing year ... $_____ 2. **Responsibility differential** for present position _____ 3. One increment for new position ($400 for certain ones; $500 for others) ... _____ Sub-total A ... $_____ **ADD (+) Item 4a:** 4a. 2/38 of Sub-total A (change from 38 to 40 weeks) ... $_____ Sub-total B ... $_____ **ADD (+) Item 4b:** 4b. 1/40 of Sub-total B **TIMES** (×) the number of additional weeks to be worked in new position over and above 40 weeks (8/40 presumably would be the maximum amount) $_____ Salary for new position ... $_____ Assuming that the teachers' M.A. maximum ($11,316) is at least unofficially recognized as a basis of 1.00, the following ratios result: Supervisory/Administrative Position (Only those working 40 weeks shown) — Work Year (School year = 183 days) — Ratio Applying **Principals:** Elementary—1000 or less pupils ... 1.30 Junior High—1000 or less pupils ... 1.40 Senior High—1800 or less pupils ... 1.50 Directing Principal ... 1.50 **Assistant Principals:** Elementary ... 1.15 Junior High ... 1.20 Senior High ... 1.25 Coordinator ... 1.10 Supervisor ... 1.40 Assistant Supervisor ... 1.30 Directing Supervisor ... 1.40 $500 more a year paid to: Elementary principals with 1001 or more pupils or responsible for two schools. Junior high principals with 1001 or more pupils. Senior high principals with 1801 or more pupils. No allowance for service in disadvantaged or lower socio-economic areas. **Longevity increments** of $300 apply after 25, 30, and 35 years in Cleveland Public School service.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
DALLAS, TEXAS	Independent of teachers' salary schedule Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$5800-$8150 M.A.—$6100-$9100 Doc.—$7000-$9850	**Master's** degree required for supervisory and administrative positions (except for Lunchroom Department supervisory personnel where A.B. and M.A. salary schedules apply); higher schedule for those with earned **doctorate.** **State administrator's certificate** required for principals and assistant principals. **State supervisor's certificate** required for consultants, coordinators, and directors serving in an instructional supervisory capacity. Arbitrarily assigning a base of 1.00 to the M.A. maximum ($11,900) of principals in the smallest elementary schools, the following ratios result when applied to the M.A. and doctorate maximums for other administrative and supervisory personnel.

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 9 months)	Ratio Applying M.A.-Max.	Ratio Applying Doc.
Elementary Principals:			
ADA of less than 250	10½ months	1.00	1.08
ADA of 250-399	10½ months	1.02	1.09
ADA of 400-649	10½ months	1.04	1.12
ADA of 650 or more	10½ months	1.07	1.14
Junior High Principals	11 months	1.18	1.25
Senior High Principals	11 months	1.30	1.38
Assistant Principals:			
Elementary	10 months	1.00	1.08
Junior High	10 months	1.02	1.09
Senior High	10 months	1.04	1.12
Instructional Assistants— Elem. and Sec.	12 months	1.60	1.67
Personnel Assistant	12 months	1.60	1.67
Administrative Assistants	12 months	1.48	1.55
Directors	12 months	1.48	1.55
Consultants	11 months	1.18	1.25
Supervisors	10 months	1.02	1.09

At the discretion of the superintendent, principals of high schools with ADA of 2500 or more may be allowed $700 (one increment) above maximum scheduled.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
DENVER, COLORADO	Presumably independent of teachers' salary schedule, but former ratio index based on the teachers' M.A. maximum ($10,625) is still evident = 1.00. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6000-$9575 M.A.—$6200-$10,625 Doc.—$6200-$11,690	Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 190 days) — Ratio Applying Principals: Elementary— Less than 16 teachers ..... 200 days ..... 1.35 16 or more teachers ..... 200 days ..... 1.40 (Number of teachers will no longer be a factor beginning with the 1969-70 school year) Junior High ..... 215 days ..... 1.50 Senior High ..... 225 days ..... 1.65 Assistant Principals: Elementary ..... 200 days ..... 1.25 Junior High ..... 200 days ..... 1.28 Senior High ..... 200 days ..... 1.30 Deans ..... 200 days ..... 1.25 Supervising Teachers ..... 200 days ..... 1.25 Coordinators ..... 200 days ..... 1.25 Supervisors ..... 225 days ..... 1.40 Supervisors ..... 235 days ..... 1.45 Directors ..... 225 days ..... 1.50 Directors ..... 235 days ..... 1.55 Administrative Directors ..... 235 days ..... 1.60 Executive Director I ..... 235 days ..... 1.70 Executive Director II ..... 235 days ..... 1.75 Executive Director III ..... 235 days ..... 1.80 Preparation beyond the Master's degree is not recognized at the present time, but additional compensation will apply beginning September 1, 1969: one increment for the Education Specialist degree; two increments for the earned doctorate.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
DETROIT, MICHIGAN	Index plan with teachers' M.A. maximum ($11,700) = 1.00 Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$7500-$11,200 M.A.—$8000-$11,700 Doc.—$8600-$12,700	Recognize **advanced degrees** in salary schedule for supervisors and administrators. **Responsibilities and accountability** are also reflected in the schedule, but the socioeconomic status of an area is not. Applying the teachers' M.A. maximum to M.A. maximum salaries for administrators and supervisors, the following ratios result: —continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
DETROIT, MICHIGAN—continued		Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 39 weeks) — Ratio Applying Principals: Elementary ..... 39 weeks ..... 1.43 Secondary ..... 39 weeks ..... 1.54 Building Trades ..... 12 months ..... 1.58 Assistant Principals: Elementary ..... 39 weeks ..... 1.17 Secondary ..... 39 weeks ..... 1.33 Building Trades ..... 12 months ..... 1.36 Coordinator ..... 39 weeks ..... 1.15 Supervisor ..... 39 weeks ..... 1.33 Administrative Assistant ..... 12 months ..... 1.46 Assistant Director ..... 12 months ..... 1.59 Director ..... 12 months ..... 1.74 Elementary principals and assistant principals of certain schools are placed on the secondary principal and assistant principal salary schedule; junior high principals and assistant principals of certain schools are placed on the elementary principal and assistant principal salary schedule. Pupil enrollment is the determining factor, but the size of the enrollment is not explained. Classification of schools by size is done annually.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
FORT WORTH, TEXAS	Index plan with teachers' M.A. maximum ($8069) = 1.00 Board of Education sets salary of superintendent and the assistant superintendents. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$5729-$7669 M.A.—$5969-$8069 Doc.—$6569-$8669	School year is 9 months. Length of work year for principals and secondary vice-principals is 12 months. Ratios Applying Based on ADA of: Supervisory/Administrative Position — 200-300 — 301-750 — 751-1099 — 1100-1450 — 1451-1799 — 1800-2150 Principals: Elementary ..... 1.32 — 1.38 — 1.45 — 1.51 — 1.57 — 1.64 Middle and Jr. High 1.40 — 1.46 — 1.52 — 1.58 — 1.64 — 1.71 Senior High ..... 1.49 — 1.55 — 1.62 — 1.68 — 1.74 — 1.80 Vice-Principals: Junior High/Middle 1.17 — 1.23 — 1.29 — 1.35 — 1.41 — 1.47 Senior High ..... 1.22 — 1.28 — 1.34 — 1.41 — 1.47 — 1.53 2nd V-P, Jr. High .. 1.11 — 1.17 — 1.23 — 1.29 — 1.35 — 1.41 2nd V-P, Sr. High .. 1.13 — 1.19 — 1.25 — 1.32 — 1.38 — 1.45 Salary for elementary assistant principals is based on a work year of 9½ months with the following ratios applying: 1st Yr. — 2nd Yr. — 3rd Yr. — 4th Yr. — 5th Yr. 1.11 — 1.12 — 1.14 — 1.16 — 1.18

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

FORT WORTH, TEXAS—continued

Position	Work Year		Ratio Applying
Consultants	12 months		1.57
Directors (various areas)	12 months	flat rates ranging from a low of	1.69
		to a high of	2.17
Assistant Directors (various areas)	12 months	flat rates ranging from a low of	1.50
		to a high of	1.66
Coordinator, Instr. Materials	12 months		1.60
Special Assistant to Supt.	12 months		1.45
Materials and Media Specialist	12 months		1.36

Salary recognition for advanced preparation: $125 for M.A. + 12 sem. hours; $250 for M.A. + 24 sem. hours; $375 for M.A. + 36 sem. hours; $600 for Doc.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

Board of Education annually sets salary of High School principals (currently $18,447).

Salary for other supervisory/administrative personnel based on:
(1) **Base salary:** index ratio based on beginning teacher's salary with A.B. degree ($6,094) = 1.00.
(2) **Differential** added to base salary, but method not explained. Flat amount added per 19-day pay period or per calendar month, depending on the position.

Teachers' Schedule
To 12-12-68:
A.B.—$5859-$9353
M.A.—$6343-$10,535
Doc.—$6773-$11,395
From 12-13-68:
A.B.—$6094-$9727
M.A.—$6597-$10,956
Doc.—$7044-$11,851

(1) **Base salary:**

Degree	Minimum Experience	Minimum Ratio	Maximum Experience	Maximum Ratio
B.A.	0 years	1.00	18 years	1.63
M.A.	0 years	1.08	20 years	1.88
M.A. + 30 hours	0 years	1.11	20 years	1.96
Doctorate	0 years	1.15	20 years	2.03

(2) **Differential:** Takes into consideration the **longer work year** as one factor with other factors apparently considered but not specifically mentioned. The differentials are expressed in dollar amounts paid either for 19-day pay periods or for calendar months. For comparative purposes, but not to be confused with the ratios shown in (1) above, the annual differential of $1,656 paid to elementary principals in Group II is considered as 1.00 in the following table:

Position	Work Year (School Year = 190 days)		Differential Ratio
Principals:			
Elementary II	39 weeks		1.00
Elementary I	39 weeks		1.14
Assistant Principals:			
Elementary	39 weeks		0.43
High School	12 calendar months		0.94
Consultants	39 weeks		0.43
	11 calendar months		0.47
	12 calendar months		0.51

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA—continued

Position	Work Year (School Year = 190 days)	Differential Ratio
Athletic Director	39 weeks	0.64
Supervisors	11 calendar months	0.86
	12 calendar months	0.94
Directors	12 calendar months	1.29

Based on differentials in effect to 12-12-68 for those on 39 weeks; to 12-31-68 for those on 11 and 12 calendar months. A 4% raise became effective on 12-13-68 and 1-1-69, respectively.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA

Basic salary schedules for teachers plus salary supplements based on a 10, 11, or 12 months work year and levels of responsibility.

Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:
A.B.—$6000-$9000
M.A.—$7000-$10,000
Doc.—$8400-$11,400

Administrative and supervisory positions are divided into 11 categories or levels of responsibility with each subdivided according to the length of the work year. Arbitrarily using the annual supplement ($687.50) for principals with the smallest staff as a basis of 1.00, the following ratios result for other representative positions:

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 10 months)	Supplement Ratio
Principals:		
Schools with less than 18 teachers	11 months	1.00
Elementary—18 or more teachers	11 months	1.50
Junior High—18 or more teachers	11 months	2.50
Senior High—18 or more teachers	12 months	2.73
Vocational—18 or more teachers	12 months	2.73
Assistant Principals (in schools with 18 or more teachers)		
Elementary	10 months	0.82
Jr. High, Sr. High, or Vocational	10 months	1.36
Deans—Jr. High, Sr. High, or Vocational	10 months	1.14
Directors—various areas and specialties:		
Level 1	12 months	4.36
Level 2	12 months	3.27
Level 3	12 months	2.73
Assistant Directors—various areas	12 months	2.18
Coordinators—various areas and specialties:		
Level 4	12 months	2.18
Level 5	12 months	1.64
Level 7	12 months	1.09
Supervisors—various areas and specialties	12 months	1.64
Specialists—various areas	12 months	1.09

$30 per month added to basic salary schedules upon completion of 15 semester hours above requirements for each of 3 advanced graduate State certificates.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA	Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum ($12,410) plus one increment = 1.00 Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6730-$10,800 M.A.—$7600-$12,410 Doc.—$9005-$14,555	The annual increment for 10-month administrative and supervisory personnel is $370; for 12-month personnel, $444. The appropriate increment was subtracted from the salaries listed before applying the teachers' M.A. maximum in order to arrive at the applicable ratio shown below.

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 10 school months)	Ratio Applying
Principals:		
Elementary and Jr. High	10 calendar months (217 days)	
Less than 20 ctfd. staff		1.27
20-40 certificated staff		1.33
41 or more ctfd. staff		1.39
Senior High	12 calendar months	1.70
Assistant Principals—Sr. High	10 calendar months	1.18
Vice Principals—		
Elem. & Jr. High	10 calendar months	1.18
Senior High	10 calendar months	1.24
Assistant Supervisors, Assistant Directors, and Consultants I	10 calendar months	1.18
	12 calendar months	1.41
Consultants II	10 calendar months	1.27
	12 calendar months	1.52
Supervisors and Consultants III	10 calendar months	1.33
	12 calendar months	1.59
Directors I	12 calendar months	1.86
Directors II	12 calendar months	2.03

Master's degree or less is the preparation base for the above positions with the exception of the directors for whom only one salary scale is provided. For the rest, higher salaries apply for one year above the Master's, two years above the Master's, and the doctorate.

Nine steps to maximum for directors; seven steps to maximum for the rest of the positions listed.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA	40 master salary schedules, each with 5 steps minimum to maximum, are set up for administrative/supervisory positions.	A 2.75% differential exists between the master salary schedules, and a 5.5% differential between the steps in each schedule. The dollar amount for each step represents the salary earned per 4-week pay period. To arrive at the annual salary, the pay period salary, in turn, is multiplied by 10 for those working 40 weeks per year; by 10.85 for those working 43 weeks per year; and by 13.05 for those working 12 calendar months.

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA—continued	The steps in each such schedule are arrived at by **multiplying a responsibility factor** (established for each step and carried out to 5 decimals) **by the maximum step** in the salary schedule for teachers with an A.B. degree + 98 semester hours of additional preparation (currently $1300 per 4-week pay period). The responsibility factor considers for each administrative/supervisory position such matters as organizational setting, kind and difficulty of work, authority accountability, personal relationships, supervision exercised and received, training, and experience. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$7000-$9990 M.A.—$7310-$10,550 Doc.—$8280-$13,400 Los Angeles stated their teachers' salary schedule does not actually lend itself to a strictly degree basis as other factors enter in; suggested that NEA's interpretation (above) be used.	**Example:** The responsibility factor at Step 1 for senior high principals is 1.16395. Multiplying this factor by the $1300 = $1513 (pay for a 4-week period). Since senior high principals work 43 weeks per year, $1513, in turn, is multiplied by 10.85 = $16,416 (1968-69 annual salary). Should the salary for the new position at time of appointment be below that paid for the former position, the person would be placed on the step of the appropriate master salary schedule which is next above his former salary.

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year	Master Salary Schedule Responsibility Factor Applying	
School year = 40 weeks (10 school months)			
Principals:		Step 1	Step 5
Elementary	43 weeks	1.04292	1.29871
Secondary	43 weeks	1.16395	1.45150
Adult	43 weeks	1.10043	1.37425
Vice-Principals:			
Elementary	43 weeks	0.88412	1.10043
Secondary	43 weeks	0.98627	1.22833
Adult	43 weeks	0.93391	1.16395
Coordinators:			
Special Studies	12 months	1.22833	1.53219
Health Facilities	12 months	1.07168	1.33648
Administrative Coordinators:			
Secondary Education	12 months	1.19614	1.49185
Elementary Education	12 months	1.10043	1.37425
Supervisors:			
Group II	43 weeks	1.04292	1.29871
Group III	43 weeks	0.98627	1.22833
Directors:			
Special Education	12 months	1.29871	1.61889
Human Relations	12 months	1.16395	1.45150
Public Information	12 months	1.10043	1.37425
Elem. or Sec. Curriculum	12 months	1.07168	1.33648

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY	Index ratio based on teachers' A.B. minimum ($5800) = 1.00.	Supervisory and administrative positions require a Master's degree.

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY—continued	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$5800-$9280 M.A.—$6264-$9744 6 Yrs.—$6728-$10,208	

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 186 days)	Ratio Applying Min.	Ratio Applying Max.
Principals:			
Elementary	215 days	176	216
Junior High	215 days	176	216
Senior High	225 days	189	229
Assistant Principals:			
Elementary	215 days	164	204
Junior High	215 days	164	204
Senior High	225 days	174	214
Counselors:			
Elementary	215 days	165	205
Junior High	215 days	165	205
Senior High	225 days	174	214
Supervisors	215 days	216.5	256.5
Assistant Supervisors	215 days	196	236
Directors:			
I	All 12	212	252
II	months	235.5	275.5
III		262.6	302.6
Assistant Directors:			
I	All 12	170	210
II	months	203.6	243.6
III		235.5	275.5

Points added for size of faculty:

Elementary and junior high: 1 point added to principal's index and ½ point added to assistant principal's index for each teacher up to a total of 42.
Senior high: 1 point added to principal's index and ½ point added to assistant principal's index for each teacher up to a total of 50.
$250 super-maximum increment paid all those who are eligible.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE	Ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum ($9120) = 1.00 Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$5700-$8550 M.A.—$6270-$9120 Doc.—$7120-$11,120	All newly appointed principals must have a Master's degree.

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 190 days)	Ratio Applying Min.	Ratio Applying Max.
Principals:—all levels			
0-576 pupils	Elementary and Junior	1.74	2.09
577-1088 pupils	High—190 days;	1.84	2.20
1089-1600 pupils	Senior High—210 days	1.95	2.30
1601- and over pupils		2.06	2.41

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE—continued

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 190 days)	Ratio Applying Min.	Max.
Assistant Principals:			
577-1088 pupils	Not given	1.67	1.79
1089-1600 pupils		1.73	1.84
1601- and over pupils		1.78	1.89
Administrative Assistant	Not given	1.19	1.61
Area Specialist	Not given	1.48	1.74
Supervisor	Not given	1.74	2.00
Assistant Director	Not given	2.09	2.35
Director	Not given	2.44	2.70
Department Coordinator	Not given	2.70	2.96

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
MIAMI, FLORIDA	Now independent of teachers' salary schedule. Formerly based on index ratio; earlier to teachers' M.A. maximum (now $11,330); later to teachers' A.B. minimum less $200 (now $6650 — $200 = $6450) = 1.00. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6650-$10,650 M.A.—$7350-$11,330 Doc.—$8430-$12,410	Certificated supervisory and administrative salaries now negotiated separately from teachers' salaries. New plan now before Board of Education proposed 10% increase over 1967-68 salaries. For comparative purposes the 1967-68 salaries have been increased 10% and the maximum salary resulting for elementary principals in the smaller elementary schools used as an arbitrary base of 1.00 ($15,870):

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 196 days)	Arbitrary Ratio Applied
Principals:		
Elementary	206 days	
1000 or less pupils		1.00
1001-1500 pupils		1.02
Junior High	206 days	
1000 or less pupils		1.03
1001-1500 pupils		1.06
Senior High	230 days	
1500 or less pupils		1.21
1501-2000 pupils		1.23
2000 or more pupils		1.25
Adult	230 days	
900 or less pupils		1.18
901 or more pupils		1.20
Directors	230 days	
I		1.25
II		1.14
Assistant Directors I	230 days	1.17
Supervisors	230 days	
I		1.14
II		1.08
III		1.06
Assistant Supervisors and Coordinators	230 days	
I		1.06
II		1.03

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN	Index plan with teachers' maximum for M.A. plus 64 units ($12,358) = 1.00 Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6800-$10,810 M.A.—$7072-$11,326 Doc.—$7616-$12,358	Master's degree is basis of **educational preparation** for supervisory and administrative personnel. $200 is added for attainment of each of the following levels of preparation: M.A. + 16 units; M.A. + 32 units; M. A. + 48 units; and M.A. + 64 units. At the elementary level, principals are divided into four classifications which take into consideration size of the faculty and other staff members supervised and pupil enrollment (breakdown by numbers not shown).

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 190 days)	Responsibility Ratio Applying
Principals:	All: 197 days	
Elementary—Classification I		1.32
Classification II		1.35
Classification III		1.38
Classification IV		1.41
Junior High	197 days	1.45
Senior and 6-Year High	200 days	1.53
Vice-Principals and Assistants to Secondary Principals:		
Elementary	190 days	1.15
Junior High	195 days	1.22
Senior and 6-Year High	195 days	1.26
Supervising Teachers	200 days	1.11
Supervisors	12 months	1.34
Recreation Supervisors	12 months	1.33
Coordinators	12 months	1.44
Directors	12 months	1.57
Recreation Directors I	220 days	1.16
Department Directors	12 months	1.42
Assistant Directors of Divisions	12 months	1.55
Executive Directors	12 months	1.67

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA	Now independent of teachers' salary schedules.	Master's degree required for supervisory and administrative personnel. **Advanced preparation** recognized as follows: M.A. plus 15 quarter hours; M.A. plus 30 quarter hours; M.A. plus 45 quarter hours; and doctorate.
	Through 1966-67, an index plan was in operation with the teachers' M.A. maximum ($11,920) = 1.00.	$500 added to salary of elementary principals assigned to two schools. Arbitrarily assigning a base of 1.00 to the $16,270 salary of the elementary principal for comparative purposes, the following ratios result:

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN	Index plan with teachers' maximum for M.A. plus 64 units ($12,358) = 1.00 Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6800-$10,810 M.A.—$7072-$11,326 Doc.—$7616-$12,358	Master's degree is basis of **educational preparation** for supervisory and administrative personnel. $200 is added for attainment of each of the following levels of preparation: M.A. + 16 units; M.A. + 32 units; M. A. + 48 units; and M.A. + 64 units. At the elementary level, principals are divided into four classifications which take into consideration size of the faculty and other staff members supervised and pupil **enrollment** (breakdown by numbers not shown).

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 190 days)	Responsibility Ratio Applying
Principals:	All: 197 days	
Elementary—Classification I		1.32
Classification II		1.35
Classification III		1.38
Classification IV		1.41
Junior High	197 days	1.45
Senior and 6-Year High	200 days	1.53
Vice-Principals and Assistants to Secondary Principals:		
Elementary	190 days	1.15
Junior High	195 days	1.22
Senior and 6-Year High	195 days	1.26
Supervising Teachers	200 days	1.11
Supervisors	12 months	1.34
Recreation Supervisors	12 months	1.33
Coordinators	12 months	1.44
Directors	12 months	1.57
Recreation Directors I	220 days	1.16
Department Directors	12 months	1.42
Assistant Directors of Divisions	12 months	1.55
Executive Directors	12 months	1.67

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA	Now independent of teachers' salary schedules.	Master's degree required for supervisory and administrative personnel. **Advanced preparation** recognized as follows: M.A. plus 15 quarter hours; M.A. plus 30 quarter hours; M.A. plus 45 quarter hours; and doctorate.
	Through 1966-67, an index plan was in operation with the teachers' M.A. maximum ($11,920) = 1.00.	$500 added to salary of elementary principals assigned to two schools. Arbitrarily assigning a base of 1.00 to the $16,270 salary of the elementary principal for comparative purposes, the following ratios result:

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA—continued	Teachers' Schedule 1968: (Calendar Year) A.B.—$6000-$9645 M.A.—$6600-$11,920 Doc:—$7200-$13,785 1969: (Calendar Year) A.B.—$6700-$10,425 M.A.—$7300-$13,050 Doc.—$7900-$14,900	Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 190 days) — Arbitrary Ratio Applied Principals: Elementary ..... 210 days 1.00 Junior High and Elementary-Jr. High 210 days 1.07 Senior High and Junior-Senior High .... 210 days 1.15 Assistant Principals: Elementary ..... 210 days 0.85 Secondary ..... 210 days 0.97 Consultants: A ..... 210 days 1.05 B ..... 210 days 1.00 C ..... 210 days 0.97 Directors ..... 12 months 1.31 Assistant Directors ..... 12 months 1.10 Project Administrators and Research Assistants ..... 12 months 1.07

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY	Index ratio based on teachers' maximum for same amount of educational preparation (M.A.—$11,500 or M.A. + 32 credits—$11,900) = 1.00 Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6700-$11,100 M.A.—$7100-$11,500 M.A. + 32—$7500-$11,900 2-1-69: A.B.—$6700-$11,100 M.A.—$7300-$11,700 M.A. +—$7900-$12,300	All supervisory and administrative positions require a Master's degree or the approved equivalent; M.A. plus 32 additional credits or approved equivalent also recognized with additional salary. Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 180 days) — Ratio Applying Principals: All: 10 months Elementary—up to 800 pupils ..... 1.35 —over 800 pupils ..... 1.46 Junior High ..... 1.52 Senior High ..... 1.58 Vice-Principals: All: 10 months Elementary ..... 1.18 Junior High ..... 1.20 Senior High ..... 1.22 Supervisors ..... 10 months ..... 1.25 Coordinator—Community Relations 12 months ..... 1.49 Directors ..... 12 months 1.49

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA	Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum ($9300) = 1.00 and is applied to salaries for principals, assistant principals, supervisors, associate directors, and most directors. Salaries for directors in the highest category are based on comparison of salaries of like personnel in the 25 largest school districts. Teachers' Schedule through 12-31-68 as on calendar year basis: A.B.—$5400-$8700 M.A.—$5700-$9300 Doc.—$6300-$9900	Master's degree required for appointment to supervisory and administrative positions. Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 182 days) — Ratio Applying at Maximum Principals: — Pupils — Teachers — All: 182 days Schools with: up to 400 — 0-12 — 1.28 401-900 — 13-30 — 1.33 901-1400 — 31-55 — 1.36 over 1400 — over 55 — 1.46 Assistant Principals — 182 days — 1.21 Assistant Supervisors — 12 months — 1.45 Supervisors — 12 months — 1.60 Associate Directors — 12 months — 1.63 Directors in Group 4 — 12 months — 1.75 The following salary is related to salaries paid for comparable positions in the 25 largest school districts and is not geared to the ratio above. If it were, the ratio shown would result: Directors in Group 5 — 12 months — 2.15 $30 per pay period is added to salaries of principals and assistant principals with advanced preparation of 30 semester hours beyond the Master's degree; $60 per pay period for an earned doctorate.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK	Actually independent of teachers' maximum M.A. salary ($12,650), but does bear some relationship to it at certain levels (assistant principals, junior principals, and principals). Also taken into consideration, but not explained in detail, are such additional factors as years of service and advanced preparation.	Assistant principals and junior principals are on a 3-step salary schedule; principals, on a 5-step salary schedule. The rest mentioned below are on a flat rate. For comparative purposes, the maximum for elementary principals has been arbitrarily selected as a ratio factor of 1.00. Their maximum as of September 1, 1968, was $20,270; as of March 1, 1969, $20,525. Higher March salaries, however, provide the same ratio figures for the other job classifications listed as do the September 1, 1968 figures. Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 189 days) — Arbitrary Ratio Applying Principals: Elementary — 192 days — 1.00 Junior High — 192 days — 1.07 Senior High — 192 days — 1.26 Junior Principal — Not given — 0.91 Assistant Principals—all levels — Not given — 0.85 Supervisor — Not given — 0.84 Assistant Administrative Director — Not given — 1.01 —continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK—continued—	Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6750-$11,150 M.A.—$8250-$12,650 Doc.—$9350-$13,750 3-1-69: Doc.—$9500-$13,900	Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 189 days) — Arbitrary Ratio Applying Assistant Director ..... Not given ..... 1.00 Director ..... Not given ..... 1.14 Assistant principals and junior principals assigned to schools for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children receive $600 more a year; in schools for mentally retarded, $200 more a year. Principals of schools for the deaf receive $1925 more per year than do the elementary school principals. There is no added compensation based on socioeconomic considerations.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA	Index ratio based on teachers' B.A. minimum ($5800) = 1.00 Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$5800-$8816 M.A.—$6380-$9396 Doc.—$6960-$9976	Master's degree for supervisory and administrative positions. When positions with similar titles have different salary classifications (examples of supervisors and directors below), the differentiation is based on **size of the staff** and **general magnitude of the job.**

Supervisory/Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 190 days)	Ratio Applying Min.	Ratio Applying Max.
Principals:			
Elementary—up to 399 pupils	11 months	1.53	1.99
—400-699 pupils	11 months	1.63	2.09
—400-699 pupils	12 months	1.70	2.18
—700 and over pupils	12 months	1.80	2.28
Junior High	12 months	1.90	2.42
Senior High and Vocational Tech.	12 months	2.10	2.74
Assistant Principals:			
Junior High	12 months	1.70	2.18
Senior High and Vocational Tech.	12 months	1.80	2.28
Consultant	12 months	1.60	2.08
Supervisors (examples):			
Special Departments	10 months	1.31	1.73
Ed. TV, Testing	11 months	1.53	1.99
Adult Education, Curriculum Mtls.	12 months	1.80	2.28
Statistical Services	12 months	1.60	2.08
Assistant Directors—Special Dept.	11 months	1.53	1.99
Purchases and Supplies	12 months	1.80	2.28
Personnel	12 months	1.90	2.42
Directors (examples):			
Guidance, Special Projects	12 months	2.00	2.60
Adult or Elementary or Secondary Education, Personnel, Research	12 months	2.20	2.84

Add $290 a year for 30 hours of graduate work beyond the Master's when applicable toward a doctorate; an additional $290 a year for an earned doctorate.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA	Independent of teachers' salary schedule. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6200-$9560 M.A.—$7068-$11,160 Doc.—$8804-$13,268	Administrative/supervisory salaries are divided into six classifications. For comparative purposes only in the table below, maximum salary shown for principals in the smallest schools ($15,644) is arbitrarily considered as a base ratio of 1.00 and is applied to the maximum salary for those in subsequent classifications.

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 180 days)	Arbitrary Ratio Applied
Principals:		
1-14 teachers	190 days	1.00
15-24 teachers	190 days	1.05
25-42 teachers	190 days	1.10
43-59 teachers	190 days	1.15
60 and over teachers	190 days	1.20
Vice-Principals (3 classifications below that of the principal)		
In smaller schools	190 days	1.00
In larger schools	190 days	1.05
Administrative Assistant—D Class	230 days	1.10
Administrative Assistant—E Class	230 days	1.15
Directors:		
Assistant Program Director	190 days	0.95
Program Director	190 days	1.00
Director—D Class	230 days	1.10
Director—E Class	230 days	1.15
Supervisors:		
Child Welfare and Attendance	190 days	0.95
Instruction, Guidance—A Class	190 days	0.95
—B Class	190 days	1.00
—C Class	190 days	1.05
Assistant—Special Area—190 or 230 depending on position		0.95
Specialist—A Class	230 days	0.95
—B Class	230 days	1.00

Supervisory and administrative appointments require a Master's degree; higher salaries for those with additional preparation: M.A. plus 1 year additional training and with an earned doctorate or its equivalent.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
OMAHA, NEBRASKA	Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum ($11,000) = 1.00	Relate length of work year to the position and to the salary —work year not given for all classifications listed below. Aside from number of pupils, which is a factor recognized in the salary schedule for principals, additional personnel, rather than salary differential, is added to the principalships of the more demanding schools.

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

OMAHA, NEBRASKA—continued

Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:
A.B.—$6250-$10,063
M.A.—$6875-$11,000
Doc.—$8125-$12,250

Supervisory/Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 190 days)	Ratio Applying
Principals:		
Elementary	200 days	
Under 400 pupils		1.13
400-600 pupils		1.18
Over 600 pupils		1.23
Junior High	240 days	
Under 600 pupils		1.19
600-950 pupils		1.25
Over 950 pupils		1.41
Senior High	240 days	
Under 1500 pupils		1.39
1500-2000 pupils		1.48
Over 2000 pupils		1.57
Assistant Principals	Not given	
Junior High		1.15
Senior High		1.29
Assistant Supervisors	Not given	1.14
Supervisors & Coordinators	Not given	1.21
Coordinators	When 12 months	1.40
Directors	12 months	1.57

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

Independent of teachers' schedule which is:

1968-69:
A.B.—$6700-$10,900
M.A.—$7000-$11,400
Doc.—$8300-$13,300

Beginning with the 1969-70 school year, advance preparation for principals beyond the Master's degree will not be recognized. In lieu of this recognition, the Board of Education, beginning September, 1969, is reimbursing each principal for tuition costs for a maximum of 6 semester hours of professionally relevant college courses taken for credit per year to a total maximum of 30 semester hours.
At work on factors that determine the setting of supervisory/administrative salaries, but no final decision yet reached. Factors now taken into consideration in setting salaries for principals is as follows:

1. **Number of classroom teachers as of October 31:**

Elementary:	Points
18 or less	10
19-23	20
24-28	30
29-33	40
34 or more	50
Junior High:	
80 or less	50
81 or more	60
Senior High:	
55 or less	50

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
PHILADELPHIA PENNSYLVANIA—continued		56-110 ..... 60 111 or more ..... 70 Special class teachers—any level: 2-5 ..... 2 6-10 ..... 4 11-15 ..... 6 16 or more ..... 8 2. Percentage of teachers with less than 2 years' experience: 10-19 ..... 1 20-29 ..... 2 30-39 ..... 3 40-49 ..... 4 50-59 ..... 5 60-69 ..... 6 70-79 ..... 7 80 or more ..... 8 3. Vacancies as of October 31: 2-4 ..... 1 5-9 ..... 2 10 or more ..... 3 4. Average monthly percentage of pupil mobility: 5-8 ..... 1 9-12 ..... 2 13-16 ..... 3 17 or more ..... 4 5. Percentage of enrollment in a magnet program from outside the magnet school's boundaries: 5-9 ..... 1 10-14 ..... 2 15-19 ..... 3 20 or more ..... 4 Principals are then divided by levels, but the number of points applicable at each level is not given. The maximum salary for principals at Level I ($16,100) is arbitrarily assumed to be a ratio of 1.00. Ratios are as follows: Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 190 days) — Arbitrary Ratio Applying Principals: Elementary ..... 190 days Level I ..... 1.00 Level II ..... 1.06 Level III ..... 1.12 Level IV ..... 1.18 Level V ..... 1.24 Junior High ..... 190 days Level V ..... 1.24 Level VI ..... 1.30 Senior High ..... 190 days Level VI ..... 1.30 Level VII ..... 1.36 Vice Principals ..... 190 days Junior and Senior High 1.00

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA	Now independent of teachers' salary schedule, but is based on one that did take into account the teachers' M.A. maximum = 1.00. Since not now applicable, this particular ratio is not applied. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6500-$9800 M.A.—$6800-$10,400 Doc.—$8000-$11,600	Salaries are given by the month. Total salary for the year is arrived at by multiplying the monthly rate of pay by the number of months of work scheduled. The ratios given below are arbitrarily based on the monthly M.A. maximum for principals (presumably elementary) in Group V, the lowest category. This M.A. maximum is $1310 per month = 1.00. No explanation given as to the factor(s) involved in the various groups.

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 191 days)		Arbitrary Ratio Applied
Principals:			
Group V	10½ months		1.00
Group IV	10½ months		1.05
Group III—Elem. and Jr. High	10½ months		1.07
Group III—Senior High	11 months		1.07
Group II—Junior High	10½ months		1.11
Group II—Senior High	11 months		1.11
Group I	12 months		1.14
Assistant Principals	10½ months		0.91
Vice Principals	10½ months		0.93
Supervisors	10, 11, 12 months		0.91
Coordinators	10, 11, 12 months		0.86
Senior Coordinator	10 months		0.91
Associate Directors	12 months		0.93
Assistant Directors	12 months		
		Some specialties	1.05
		Other specialties	1.07
		Other specialties	1.09
Administrative Asst. to Supt.	12 months		1.04
Directors	12 months		
		Some specialties	1.07
		Other specialties	1.09
		Other specialties	1.11
		Other specialties	1.14
		Other specialties	1.16
		Other specialties	1.18
Coordinating Director	12 months		1.14
Auditor	12 months		1.32
Chief Accountant	12 months		1.32

Longevity of $30.00 per working month applicable to those with 25 years of service in public schools (at least 5 of which in Pittsburgh) plus rating of "good" or better.

$30.00 per working month added to each of the following for advance preparation: M.A. + 30 advanced study; M.A. + 30 credits; M.A. + 60 credits; Doctorate.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
PORTLAND, OREGON	Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum ($10,600) = 1.00. (School district did not verify this, but NEA reports this basis.) Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6000-$9500 M.A.—$6400-$10,600	All supervisory and administrative personnel on a 225-day standard work year unless otherwise indicated by the superintendent: 190-day work year for teachers plus one week after school closes plus two weeks before teachers report in the fall plus 20 days during the summer months. Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 190 days) — Ratio Applying Principals: — All: 225 days Elementary: 8 grades with 300-599 pupils—or less than 8 grades and 400 or more pupils — 1.44 600 or more pupils — 1.48 High School: Under 1000 pupils — 1.67 1000 or more pupils — 1.71 High School Vice-Principals — 225 days — 1.48 Supervisors—Certificated — 225 days — 1.48 235 days if ever so appointed — 1.54 Directors—Certificated — 225 days — 1.71 235 days if ever so appointed — 1.79 Assistant Supervisors—Classified — 12 months — 1.13 Assistant Coordinators—Classified — 12 months — 1.13 Supervisors—Classified — 12 months — 1.35 Coordinators—Classified — 12 months — 1.35 Classified supervisory personnel on the 12-month basis are allowed vacations as follows: 2 weeks for first 10 years of service; 3 weeks, 11-20 years; 4 weeks, 21st year and thereafter.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI	Index ratio based on teachers' M.A. maximum ($11,160) = 1.00 for school and certain central administration positions. Flat rate, set annually, and not based on a ratio for other central administration positions.	Effective September 1, 1968, recognition of the M.A. plus 30 and the Doctorate was eliminated for all administrators except subject matter consultants and department heads. Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 187 days) — Ratio Applying Principals: Elementary—less than 14 teachers — 10½ months — 1.33 14 or more teachers — 10½ months — 1.45 Senior High — 11 months — 1.60 Assistant Principals—High School — 10½ months — 1.45 —continued—

School	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI—continued

For the 1969-70 school year, expect to extend the flat rate method to all certificated positions above the rank of principal.

Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:

A.B.—$6200-$10,540
M.A.—$6820-$11,160
Doc.—$8680-$13,020

Supervisory/Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 187 days)		Arbitrary Ratio Applied
Subject Matter Consultants and Department Heads	10 months	M.A.	1.10
		M.A. + 30	1.13
		Doc.	1.16
Coordinators	10 months		1.10
High School Administrative Assistants	10 months		1.10
Supervising Teachers	10½ months		1.20
Consultants	10½ months		1.30
Assistant Directors	12 months		1.53
Directors	12 months		1.67

A flat annual rate, not geared to the teachers' M.A. maximum, is as follows for the following positions. The $14,700 salary for the Supervisor of Program Development is arbitrarily used as the base of 1.00.

Position	Work Year	Arbitrary Ratio Applying
Supervisor—Program Development	12 months	1.00
Director—Work Study Program	12 months	1.02
Director—Teacher Recruitment	12 months	1.02
Director—Computer Applications	12 months	1.20
Assistant Director—Personnel	12 months	1.22
Assistant to Superintendent	12 months	1.22
Directors of Fiscal Planning & Control, Community Relations, Federal Relations	12 months	1.27
Director—Personnel		1.29

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Index ratio based on teachers' top maximum ($13,640) = 1.00.

Teachers' Schedule 1968-69—NEA:

A.B.—$6820-$11,695
M.A.—$7760-$12,680
6 Yrs.—$8360-$13,640

Supervisory/Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 180 days)	Ratio Applying Min.	Ratio Applying Max.
Principals:			
Elementary	197 days	1.09	1.38
Junior High, Senior High, Adult	197 days	1.25	1.54
Assistant Principals:			
Elementary	Not given	1.00	1.13
Junior High, Senior High, Adult (Includes duties usually performed by dean of boys and dean of girls)	Not given	1.09	1.30
Coordinator A	231 days	1.57	1.88
Coordinator B	231 days	1.44	1.68
Supervisor A	Not given	1.09	1.38
Supervisor AA	231 days	1.31	1.55
Director	231 days	1.44	1.68

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA	Independent of teachers' schedule. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6510-$8910 M.A.—$7710-$11,600 Doc.—$14,130	The maximum salary for elementary school principals ($17,747) is arbitrarily used as a ratio basis of 1.00. A Master's degree is required for all supervisory and administrative positions.

Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 180 days)	Arbitrary Ratio Applying
Principals:		
Elementary	210 days	1.00
Junior High	213 days	1.09
Senior High	230 days	1.18
Vice Principals:		
Elementary	Not given	0.85
Junior High	Not given	0.94
Senior High	Not given	1.00
Coordinator I	Not given	0.88
Coordinator II	Not given	0.94
Supervisor I	Not given	0.97
Supervisor II	Not given	1.06
Assistant Director—Voc. Center	Not given	1.00
Director—Vocational Center	Not given	1.15
Directors	Not given	1.18
Administrative Assistant	Not given	1.12

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON	Independent of teachers' schedule. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$6175-$6975 M.A.—$6775-$9855 Doc.—$7700-$12,250	Persons appointed to supervisory and administrative positions must have a B.A. plus 90 quarter hours plus M.A. training; $600 is added for an approved doctorate. Salaries set by a Classification and Review Board after detailed study of job descriptions, amount of work and/or responsibility, accountability, and other factors, including the number of days required for a particular position. For comparative purposes, the maximum salary for elementary school principals ($15,250) is arbitrarily used as a base ratio of 1.00. —continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON—continued

Arbitrary Ratios Applying for These Work Years

Supervisory/Administrative Position	183 Days	192 Days	202 Days	217 Days	222 Days	227 Days
	(School year = 183 days)					
Principals:						
Elementary	—	—	1.00	—	—	—
Junior High	—	—	1.06	—	—	—
Senior High	—	—	1.10	—	—	—
Vice Principals:						
Elementary	—	—	0.87	—	—	—
Junior High	—	—	0.91	—	—	—
Senior High	—	—	0.94	—	—	—
Administrative Assistants:						
Salary Class 2	0.79	0.83	0.87	0.94	0.96	0.98
Salary Class 3	—	0.86	0.91	0.97	0.997	1.02
Salary Class 4	—	0.89	0.94	1.004	1.03	1.05
Salary Class 5	—	0.92	0.97	1.04	1.06	1.09
Coordinators:						
Salary Class 5	—	0.92	0.97	1.04	1.06	1.09
Salary Class 6	—	—	1.00	1.07	1.10	1.12
Directors:						
Salary Class 6	—	—	1.00	1.07	1.10	1.12
Salary Class 7	—	—	1.06	1.13	1.16	1.19
Salary Class 8	—	—	1.10	1.18	1.21	1.23
Salary Class 9	—	—	—	—	1.25	1.28
Salary Class 10	—	—	—	—	1.29	1.32

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries

TUCSON, ARIZONA

Ratio based on what administrator would earn as a teacher with comparable preparation and experience.

Teachers' Schedule 1968-69:

A.B.—$5900-$9234
M.A.—$6343-$11,181
Doc.—$7021-$12,095

Supervisory/Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 185 days)	Ratio Applying
Principals:		
Elementary	10 months	1.35
Junior High	10 months	1.40
High School	12 months	1.55
Assistant Principals:		
Junior High	10 months	1.30
Senior High	12 months	1.40
Deans	9½ months	1.20
Coordinators	10 months	1.30
Directors	12 months	1.45
Supervisors	10 months	1.35

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries			
		Supervisory/ Administrative Position	Work Year (School year = 184 days)	Ratio Applying for M.A. Min.	Max.
TULSA, OKLAHOMA	Index ratio based on teachers' A.B. minimum ($5400) = 1.00. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$5400-$7992 M.A.—$5832-$8856 Doc.—$6912-$10,368	Principals:			
		Elementary	9½ months	1.85	2.18
		Junior High	Teaching Units:		
			29 or less ... 10 months	1.95	2.31
			34	1.97	2.33
			39	1.99	2.35
			44	2.01	2.37
			49	2.03	2.39
			54 or more	2.05	2.41
		Senior High	49 or less ... 12 months inc. vacation	2.20	2.62
			54	2.22	2.64
			59	2.24	2.66
			64	2.26	2.68
			69	2.28	2.70
			74	2.30	2.72
			79 or more	2.32	2.74
		Assistant Principals:—based on NEA figures			
		Elementary	9 months	1.42	1.93
		Junior High	9½ months	1.61	2.15
		Senior High	10 months	1.68	2.21
		Coordinators—Instruction	Not given	1.70	2.03
		Supervisors—Instruction	Not given		
		Lowest grouping		1.70	2.03
		Highest grouping		1.80	2.13
		Directors—Instruction:			
		Lowest grouping	10 months	1.90	2.26
		Highest grouping	12 months	2.00	2.36
		Supervisors—Special Services:			
		Lowest grouping	Not given	1.50	1.82
		Middle grouping	Not given	1.70	2.03
		Highest grouping	12 months	1.80	2.13
		Assistant Directors—Special Services	Not given	1.62	1.96
		Directors—Special Services:			
		Lowest grouping	Not given	1.70	2.03
		2nd grouping	10 months	1.90	2.26
		3rd grouping	Not given	2.00	2.36
		Highest grouping	Not given	2.10	2.50
		Assistant Directors—Supt. Staff	Not given	2.30	2.74
		Directors—Supt. Staff:			
		Lowest grouping	Not given	2.40	2.86
		Middle grouping	Not given	2.50	2.98
		Highest grouping	Not given	2.60	3.08
		Wage and Salary Analyst	Not given	2.30	2.74

—continued—

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
TULSA, OKLAHOMA—continued		Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 184 days) — Ratio Applying for M.A. (Min. / Max.) Directors—Business Services: Lowest grouping ..... Not given 2.10 2.50 Middle grouping ..... Not given 2.30 2.74 Highest grouping ..... Not given 2.50 2.98 Supplemental ratios added as follows for higher preparation: 0.08 for M.A. plus 30 approved hours; 0.08 for M.A. plus 60 approved hours; 0.12 for an earned doctorate.

School District	Relationship between Supervisory/Administrative and Teacher Salary Schedules	Considerations and Factors Taken into Account in Setting Supervisory/Administrative Salaries
WASHINGTON, D. C.	Index plan with teachers' M.A. maximum ($11,550) = 1.00. Congress makes decisions as to what salary schedules shall be 1968-69 shall be. 1968-69 salaries represented a 17% increase over 1967-68. Teachers' Schedule 1968-69: A.B.—$7000-$10,850 M.A.—$7700-$11,550 Doc.—$8400-$12,250	Supervisory/Administrative Position — Work Year (School year = 184 days) — Ratio Applying Principals: ..... All 218 days Level I ..... 1.47 Level II ..... 1.52 Level III ..... 1.56 Level IV ..... 1.60 (All principals—elementary, junior high, and senior high—on the same salary schedule. Levels are based on several factors of which size accounts for 90%) Assistant Principals ..... Not given ..... 1.40 (All assistant principals—elementary, junior high, and senior high—on the same salary schedule.) Supervising Directors ..... Not given ..... 1.45 Directors ..... Not given Group 5 ..... 1.65 Group 6 ..... 1.60 Group 7 ..... 1.45 The above ratios are all based on M.A. maximums for the positions listed. $350 (0.03 ratio) is added for an M.A. + 30 credit hours; another $350 for an earned doctorate.